R. N. K
4324.cc.20

THE CHRISTIANS MANNA.

OR

A TREATISE

Of the most Blessed and Reuerend Sacrament of the EVCHARIST.

Deuided into two Tracts.

Written by a Catholike Deuine, through occasion of *Monsieur Casaubon* his Epistle to *Cardinal Peron*, expressing therin the Graue and Approued Iudgment of the KINGS MAIESTY, touching the doctrine of the Reall Presence in the EVCHARIST.

Patres vestri manducauerunt Manna in deserto, & mortui sunt: Qui manducat hunc panem, viuet in æternum. Ioan. 6.

Tunc in ænigmate erat Manna cibus: nunc autem in specie caro Verbi Dei est verus cibus. *Origen. homil. 7. in lib. Numer.*

Imprinted with Licence, Anno 1613.

THE CHRISTIAN'S MANNA.

OR

A TREATISE

Of the moſt Bleſſed and Reuerend Sacrament of the EVCHARIST.

BRITISH MUSEUM

Written by a Catholike Deuine, through occaſion of Monſieur Caſimbon his Epiſtle to Cardinal Perron, expreſſing therin the Graue and Approued Iudgment of the KINGS MAIESTY, touching the doctrine of the Reall Preſence in the EVCHARISTE.

Patres vestri manducauerunt Manna in deserto, & mortui sunt: Qui manducat hunc panem, vivet in aeternum. Ioan. 6.

Tunc in enigmate erat Manna cibus: nunc autem in specie. caro Verbi Dei est vera cibus. Origen. homil. 7. in lib. Numer.

Imprinted with Licence, Anno 1613.

TO

THE KINGS MOST EXCELLENT MAIESTY.

MOST VVORTHY KING, AND MY DREAD SOVERAIGNE,

LET it not seeme offensiue, that I (one of your Maiesties meanest subiects) do heere presume to present this vnpolished Discourse to your Highnesse, vvhose Iudgment in Learning is so exquisite, as that it brooketh therein only labours of

Perfection. Neuertheles this my humble Ambition (so to tearme it) appeareth to me vvarrantable for seuerall reasons.

One, in that Princes are truly interessed not only in their Subiects goods of Fortune, but euen in their Intellectuall goods of the Mynd; and therefore hovv smal soeuer my Talent is herein, it ought to be appropriated and referred to your seruyce.

The other (more particulet) is, because your Maiesty is the principall Motyue of my vvrytıng this little imperfect vvorke. Novv, vvhither should the riuers run, but into the Ocean, from vvhence originally they receaued their springs? For hauing perused the Epistle of *Monsieur Casaubon*, vvritten to the Learned & Illustrious *Cardinal Peron*, as himselfe intimateth, by your Highnesse priuity, if not command and direction, I find therein, that your Graue and Learned Iudgment doth most fully imbrace the Orthodo-

thodoxall doctrine of the *Reall Presence* of the Eucharist, dissenting from the Roman and Catholike Church only in resting doubtfull of the manner of the Presence. For these (besides other like passages) are *Monsieur Casaubons* vvords: *Haec fides Regis, haec fides Ecclesia Anglicana* &c. concluding, after he hath related the iudgment of the Bishop of *Ely* herein, thus in the Bishops vvords: *Dixit Christus, Hoc est Corpus meum; non hoc modo, Hoc est Corpus meum ... vobis autem vobiscum de obiecto conuenit, de modo lis omnis est* &c. *Praesentiam credimus, nec minus quam vos veram* &c.

Novv seing your Maiesty hath made such a happy declaration in the beliefe of this high Mystery, I thought it my duty (soluing aforehand all such difficultyes, as may seeme in a vulgar Eye to imply an Impossibility thereof) to publish to the vvorld the chiefe Reasons vvhich do fortify your former receaued doctrine; and

further humbly to preſent and exhibite to your Iudicious Eye the vveighty Authorities, vvhich mooue the Church of Rome to belieue the patticuler manner of Chriſts Exiſtency in the Sacrament.

Which tvvo Points are promiſcuouſly handled in this Treatiſe, ſince both in explicating the doubts, and in diuers of the Proofs alledged, the one doth often inter-ueyne the other: yet for the greater perſpicuity, I haue ſorted to one Head all the moſt forcing Authoritys of the ancient Fathers, vvhich in plaine and direct tearmes do euict a true & perfect Change of the Bread and Wyne, into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt; ſo clearly acknovvledging by ſuch their teſtimonyes the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Among ſo many of vvhich kind, I cannot heere omit that of S. *Cyril* of *Ieruſalem* an ancient and learned Father, *Catech.* 4. *Hoc ſciens, & pro certiſſimo habens, panē hunc, qui videtur à nobis, non eſſe panem, etiamſi*

etiamsi gustus panem esse sentiat, sed esse corpus Christi. Et vinum, quod à nobis conspicitur, tametsi sensus gustus vinum esse videatur, non tamen vinum, sed sanguinē Christi esse.] A point so euident, that *Monsieur Casaubon* ingenuously confesseth, that the Greek vvords [illegible], (vvhich do necessarily imply a true chang of one thing into another) are heerin frequently vsed by the Greeke Fathers.

THIS THEN is that faith, vvhich vvas so vnanimously maintayned (as shall hereafter fully appeare) by the Reuerend Doctours of the Primitiue Church, and no lesse religiously beleeued by so many of your Royall Ancestours, and particularly by that most vertuous and renovvned Queene, your Maiestyes deare Mother; to vvhom it vvas granted by God, that she *should vvash her robes in the blood of the Lambe*: A Princesse, in vvhom aboundace of Goodnes at length

became

became criminall; and vvho, as being a Queene, and excelling not only all of her State, but of her Sexe in a ſpirituall Reſolution and greatnes of Mynd, vvas much admyred throughout all Chriſtendome; and yet for bringing forth ſo fortunate and vvorthy a Branch, as your Maieſty is, ought to be more peculiarly reuerenced by vs English. And therefore in this reſpect, I may freely ſay, that ſince the Child is the Image of the Parent, vve Englishmen by eternizing her Memory, haue iuſt reaſon (cõtrary to the doctrine of the Schooles) heere to honour the Prototypon euen for the Image ſake: Fevv other Mothers in our age being vvorthy of ſuch a Sonne, fevv other Sõns vvorthy of ſuch a Mother.

But novv (moſt Gratious Prince) ſince the former doctrine of the Reall Preſence is one mayne Article of that Religiõ, for vvhich the Profeſſors therof are daily ſo grieuouſly afflicted; We the impoueri-

impouerished, deiected, & (in our Aduersaries Eye) despicable Catholikes of England, do heere vpon our knees lye battering at your Maiesties eares, vvith our incessant Supplications, for some ease and release of our former pressures, and vexations.

This Mercy vve humbly beseech at your hands, euen for his sake, vvho out (of a sea of Mercy vvas content to abase himselfe to the opprobrious death of the Crosse, for the Honour and Loue of him, vvhose Image not only by Creation, but in Gouernment all Princes are (*Ego dixi Dijestis*) and therfore are bound the more zealously to imitate him in his most glorious title of Mercy; euen by that hope of Mercy, vvhich your Maiesty appearing before the Diuine Maiesty, at the most dreadfull Day, doth expect to obtayne: Finally for the deare remembrãce of that blessed Princesse your Mother, vvho dyed (I vvill not say chiefly

 for,

for, but I am certayne) in our Catholike Religion, and doth (no doubt) nowv daily offer vp an incense of praiers to God for the relenting of your mynd herein, naturally enclined to the cõmiseration of the distressed.

Suffer not (ô suffer not) so many innocent and Loyall Subiects, thus, yeare after yeare, to breath (for our afflictions considered, howv can it be said vve lyue?) in a continuall Night of Misery; vvhose Bodyes and States (like Balles) are tossed to and fro, at the vvill and pleasure of our hungry and pittilesse Aduersaries.

You are our *Prince*, and therein ordayned to protect vs from vvrongs & iniuryes: and in further vvarrant of the same, your Highnes may say vvith *Lot*, *Ingressi sunt sub vmbra culminis mei*. We are your Subiects, and therefore stand obliged to acknowvledge the strictest Band of Allegiance, due either by the Lavv of Nature, by the Lavv of God, or

by the example of any Christian Subiects towards their Princes, euer since our Redemption, till the fall of that most vnhappy and Apostating *Monke*.

Let not then the perpetrated crymes of some few, so diuert the beames of your Gracious Clemency from vs all, as that the Punishmẽt due only vnto them (like the Effect of another Originall Sinne) should propagate and extend it selfe vpon the whole Body, and Posterity of Catholikes: but rather, reiecting all the subtile Machinations & wyse follyes of our Politick Aduersaryes (which we trust that finally God will frustrate) haue a frequent remembrance of that saying: *Superexaltat Misericordia iudiciũ Iustitiæ tuæ*; in which words your Highnes may thinke, that the Apostle *Iames* preacheth to *King Iames*.

BVT NOW, as fearing to become ouer tedious (for which reason, as also out of an humble Reuerẽce I do for-

beare hereafter in this Treatise to direct further speaches to your Highnes) I heere will cease, casting my selfe at your Maiestyes feet as lovv, as Humility and Loyalty can prostrate themselues, and praying to the Almighty to preserue you in a Blessed Gouerment ouer vs many (many) yeares; and after the Period of this life, to graunt your Highnes the Honour and Happines in being another *Dauid*, by enioyning twvo *Ierusalems*.

Your Maiesties most Loyall & humble Subiect.

R. N.

THE

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

GOod Christian Reader, Heere I present thee with a small Treatise of a large Subiect; it being one of the chiefest Questions of Christian Religion, cõtrouerted at this day betweene the Catholike, and the Caluinist. It is written with intention to confirme thy Iudgment in so weighty a Point, being already rectified; to reforme it, being erroneous; and therfore I expect a retaliation, charitably to entertaine my charitable meaning. If

If this little worke (the yong *Samuel* proceeding from the long barren wombe of my Braine) may become profitable to any one, I haue my desire. As for the censures which will passe therof, I presage they will be as various, as Mens iudgments are various; but heerin I am indifferent, for (how meane soeuer) it is, as it is, and of all the Elements I least pryze the Ayre: Yet heere by the way I must aduertise my ignorãt Protestant Reader (for to the more Learned this is needlesse) who euer dislikes, what is not so courteous, as to come within the reach of his narrow headpeece, that I do looke, that he should charge these poore Leaues (especially the first Part heerof) with mayne Contrarieties, and Contradictions; Yet if his Pryde would vouchsafe to remember (or rather to learne) that all true Contradictions do euer consist in one and the same reference of Circumstances, and that such seeming heere, are reconciled by different Respects explicated in the marginal Annotations, he might well rest satisfied.

Wherfore I do heere premonish all such, but particulerly them, who eyther by Pen, or

Tongue

Tongue are become publike Patrones of the Sacramentarian Nouelty, not maliciously to insist alone in the said naked appearing Repugnances, concealing their Illustrations; tragically by this means, amplifying the strange supposed Paradoxes (forsooth) defended by vs Catholikes heerin: Which if they shall attempt (by diuorcing the one from the other) now after this conuenient forwarning, they are to be reputed, but as Men conscious of their owne bad Cause, and willing fraudulently to abuse the weake Iudgments of their followers.

I haue deuided this Treatise into two Parts. *In the first*, I proue, that it is possible (for the existence of any thing euer presupposeth a possibility of the same existence) that the sacred Body and Bloud of our Sauiour, may truly & really be contayned vnder the formes of Bread & Wine; and that though the effecting therof doth transcend Nature, yet doth it not ouerthrow Nature.

This labour I am forced to vndertake in regard of our Aduersaries [illegible], and consultation with God heerin: for they maintayne

in their Wrytings with great estuation and heat of dispute (like (a) *raging waues of the sea, foaming out their owne shame*) that to be at once in diuers places, or to want all circumscription of place (besides many other difficulties occurring in the Catholike doctrine of the Eucharist) are against the nature of a true Body, and therfore cānot be accomplished by God. In which point they partake ouer neere with the ancient Philosophers, though (perhaps) with their greater offence towards God, then it was in those Heathens, since in such cases that saying houldeth, κρίσεως (b) ἡ κακοηθείας τῆς ἀπιστίας.

The reason why the Sacramentaryes do belieue the words of Christ in the doctrine of the Eucharist so little, is because they belieue their Sense therin so much: for they are resolued, that their outward sense shall heere euen prescribe Lawes to their faith; & whatsoeuer may seeme to be incōpatible therwith (as the forme, the colour, the tast &c.) the maintayning therof to be reputed as an exploded Errour. In which kind of proceeding they appeare in my conceipt, to deale more niggardly with the faith of Christ, then euer the

(c) *Do-*

(o) *Donatists* did with the Church of Christ; since they, though banishing the Church out of all the other partes of the World, yet were content to allot to it the whole Countrey of *Africke*: whoras these labour to withdraw our faith herein from all the chiefe Powers of our Mind, and to confine it within the narrow compasse of the ball of the Eye, or the end of the tongue: So far off is the Sould (immersed in Sense) from apprehending truly this high and reuerend Mystery.

The second Part heerof iustifying his Maiesties learned Iudgment heerin, deliuereth the diuine Authorities of both the Testaments, for confirmation of the *Reall Presence*: it contayneth the Prophesies of the ancient *Rabbins* therof; it reporteth the Myracles exhibited by God in warrant of the same; it discouereth the weakenesse of such testimonyes as are out of the Scripture obiected to the cõtrary; finally, it displayeth the innouation and first appearance of the Sacramentarian Doctrine. But because our Aduersaries do vse diuers circulations, and inflexions to and fro (for they most strangely detort the holy

Scripture, and insolently reiect the other proofes; therfore to draw them to a more particular sight, I haue reduced the issue of this point to the iudgments of the ancient Fathers of the Primitiue Church, in whose (*) Wrytings many of the Sacramentaries seeme to haue good confidence, and from whose Censures they cannot iustly appeale; since it is said: *Non (d) te præterea narratio Seniorum; ipsi enim didicerunt à Patribus suis.*

And so the mayne drift of that Part is to shew, that those Fathers vnanimously maintayned the now Catholike doctrine of the Reall Presence, and of Transubstantiation. Which poynt being once proued, conuinceth fully, and irrephably the Sacramentaries in this Controuersie: both because it must of necessity be presumed, that the Fathers did draw their faith heerin from the true exposition of the Scriptures; as also in that the tyme wherin they liued, was (euen by the generall acknowledgment of all) then, when the glorious splendor of Christs Ghospell was neuer hid from the Christians of

* * *

those

those Ages; still openly shyning without any Eclipse, or supposed darkenesse; like the Sunne which in some Countreys, and for certayne seasons neuer (e) sets, but continueth rolling about with great light in the eyes of the Inhabitants.

GOOD READER, if thou be vnlearned, I could wish thee (resting thy selfe in the second Part, which is facile and easie) to passe ouer this first; since it will rather intricate thy iudgment, then iustruct it, it being therunto as strong Wines to weake braines. For it intreateth of diuers high and speculatiue Points, and such as are aduerse to a cõmon Vnderstanding, and therfore an ignorant Man (whose Reason oftentimes is but his Sense) can hardly penetrate them. And though thou shalt find there all such difficultyes fully explaned, yet it is questionable, whether thou art able (presuming thee to be such an one, as heere I meane) to apprehend the Answeres as well as the Doubtes: for a weake and confused iudgment may suggest or conceaue difficulties, but it is a cleare Iudgment, that must resolue them. And the

reason of the disparity herein is this; To take one thing for another, or to erre in the proper nature and essence of things (which is incident especially to the vnlearned) is the sourse of Doubts and Questions; but to be able to marshall togeather things of one nature; and to seuer and sunder things asunder, which carry a great likenesse one to another (for such resemblance of particularities euer begottes mistakings) as also to know what essentially is agreeing to the nature of any thing, and what but accessorily and accidentally accompanyeth the same; is a worke of the Iudicious: Wherfore it is no vulgar hand, that can euenly cut the small threed in such nyce speculations, Hence it is, that in regard of the manifold errours of this nature, wherunto the vnlearned are subiect, we hould, that in such abstracted difficulties, as also in some others, beating only vpon some circumstance of the high Mysteryes of Christian faith (so that our Iudgment be implicitly at least resigned to the Church therin) an humble and vnaffected Ignorance is a safe and secure knowledge.

This first Part then was written to giue satisfaction to those curious prying Wits of this Age, who euen mad with Reason (and may I not so terme them, who labour to wound him by force of Reason, who is the only Author and giuer of Reason?) do seeke to destroy the Catholike faith herein, by restrayning the Power of him (euen of him, *who hath* (f) *founded the earth vpon the seas, and established it vpon the floods*) within the narrow lymits of Philosophy; so making *Aristotle*, & other vnbelieuing Philosophers to set downe certayne cancells; and bounds to his Diuine Maiesty, beyond which he must not passe: Thus do those, who vaunt themselues, as the Children of Light, borrow their Light from the Children of Darknesse. And so these Men (being become learnedly ignorant) can hardly beleiue any thing, which may seeme to carry repugnancy to the setled course of Nature, expecting indeed at our hands (though contrary to the Apostles (g) definition therof) a demonstrable faith. But against such as impugne faith by naturall Reason, we may well apply the re-

prehenſion of *S. Auguſtine: Ecce* (h) *qualibus argumentis Omnipotentiæ Dei humana contradicit Infirmitas, quam poſsidet Vanitas.*

Now further in behalfe of our Catholike doctrine in this great Controuerſie, and to obtund and blunt in generall all reaſons deduced from Reaſon, for the deſtroying of the ſame; I do heere auouch, that Mans Vnderſtanding doth find a greater repugnancy in giuing an aſſent to thoſe immediate, and neceſſary Inferences, which do ineuitably flow from the Proteſtants Principles, then in believing the moſt abſtruſeſt Difficulties in the Euchariſt: Which point (I grant) doth not ryſe from any inexplicable or ſupernaturall Myſteries, appearing in ſuch their Illations (for ſince their faith is mainly (i) *Negatiue*, conſiſting, for the moſt part, in annihilating, & ouerthrowing the affirmatiue Poſitions of the Catholike faith, it cannot be inuolued with any ſuch obſcurities:) but it proceedeth, in that their Doctrine doth neceſſarily exhale, and breath forth ſuch groſſe, abſurd, and exorbitant Concluſions, as that by believing them, they darken and cloud

euen

euen the naturall Light of the Vnderſtanding. I will inſtance this (as vnwilling to tranſgreſſe the bounds of an Epiſtle, and reſeruing the larger diſplaying of this point to ſuch opportunity, as may (perhaps) heereafter preſent it ſelf to ſome one Catholike Writer or other) in this one Aſſertion, firſt broached by (a) *Luther* himſelfe, to wit, that faith alone is ſo potent in cauſing our Iuſtification, that workes are not only not neceſſary, but hurtfull therto; and ſo the moſt perfect faith is the leaſt ſpotted (in his iudgment) with good Workes.

Now heere I would demaund, how it can enter into any brayne, but to weene, that faith in Chriſt ſhould engender a life impugned by Chriſt? and beleiuing in him, that dyed for the expiation of ſinne, ſhould be no ſmall inducement to vs for to ſinne? Or that Workes ſhould be hurtfull to the great Worke of our Iuſtification? And thus if we credit theſe Men, we are commaunded by the (b) Apoſtle, *to worke*, without workes (marke you the riddle?) *your ſaluation in feare and trembling*. Is man created to the Image of

God

God, I meane his Soule endued with the fiery sparke of Reason (deryued from that still-burning Lamp therof in God) and can it nertheleſſe giue assent to such vnreasonable, improbable, and impossible resultancyes?

But to returne. Heere I thinke good to put the Reader in mind, that wheras diuers of the most eminent and learned Protestants heere in *England* (as appeareth from the Pens of the Bishop of [m] *Ely*, and *Monsieur* [n] *Casaubon*) do absolutely acknowledge a reall and true being of Christs Body in the Eucharist, far different from *Caluins*, and the Sacramentaryes meere representatiue, and typicall Presence therof; it therfore followeth, that the said Protestants so believing, stand as full chargeable for the soluing of all the great Difficultyes therof, as we Catholikes doe; whether they concerne a body being at once in seuerall places, or a body to exist indiuisibly without any circumscription of Place, and the like (those only excepted which are both fewer, and lesse abstruse) as spring from the Question of Transubstantiation, which is but one branch (as respecting

cting only the manner of the Preſence) of this great Queſtion of the Euchariſt. Hence then it ryſeth, that ſuch other Proteſtants, as diſclayme from the doctrine of the Catholikes in the point of the Reall Preſence, by reaſon of ſo many Difficulties appearing therin, muſt alſo for the ſame reſpect, diſauow the doctrine of the former Learned Proteſtants. And therefore I could wish them (ſince Humility exacteth ſo much at their hands) to ſubmit themſelues herein (though not to our Authorityes, yet) to the graue iudgments of our Soueraigne, & their owne English Church, who for the more cleare explicating of all ſuch doubts, muſt needes admit the Catholikes Solutions and Anſweres.

And now before I end, I am to admonish the Reader ſtill to haue in his remembrance, whoſe and what Body it is, which we belieue to haue this ſupernaturall exiſtence in the Euchariſt. It is his Body, of whom in this dreadfull Myſtery S. *Hierome* (o) ſaith, *Ipſe eſt Conuiua & Conuiuium: ipſe comedens, & qui comeditur*. It is alſo that Body, about the which

ſo many aſtonishing wonders haue at ſeuerall tymes beene effected: A little before the Nativity thereof (for we read, *Conceptus eſt de Spiritu Sancto*,) at the very inſtant of his Birth (for, *natus eſt ex Maria Virgine*;) ſome ſmall tyme after his Death (for, *tertia die reſurrexit*,) vpon his laſt departure from vs (for, *aſcendit ad Cælos*,) Nature her ſelfe was in all theſe Paſſages, if not diſſolued, yet at leaſt ſuſpended: Yea when he heere conuerſed vpon Earth, was not that ſame Body ſometimes (p) nourished without eating, at other tymes did eate without any nourishment therby? Did it not (euen remayning (q) Viſible) become Inuiſible? Finally, did it not walke moſt firmly vpon the (r) liquid Element, ſo as the vnſtable water then ſupported him, who ſupports the Heauens? If then Nature did ſubiect and humble herſelfe ſo often to this ſacred Body, how can we Chriſtiãs doubt of the infallible certainty of thoſe words, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum* (in which as the chiefe Latin (s) Father ſaith, *vocatur Caro, quod non capit Caro*) proceeding from our true and Powerfull Lord, ſince Truth acknow-

* * * *

ledgeth

ledgeth not Falshood, not Omnipotency Deficiency?

AND thus (Good Reader) remitting thee to the perusall heerof (which I much wish, that it may be to thy spirituall Good) I take my leaue, earnestly entreating thy remembrance of me, at the tymes of thy best Deuotions.

Thy Catholike & well-willing friend,

R. N.

(a) *Raging waues.*] Iudæ Epist.

(b) *κύματα &c.*] *Falsa fides, infidelitate peior.*

(c) *Donatists.*] *August. de Vnitate Ecclesiæ.*

(d) *In whose writings.*] See hereof the later end of the Marginall References of the first Chapter of the Second Part, at the letter (q).

(e) *Nonte prætereat.*] *Ecclesiast. cap. 8.*

(f) *Neuer setteth.*] The Sunne being in the Septentrionall part of the *Zodiack*, neuer setteth for halfe of the yeare togeather, to those, to whom the North Pole is so eleuated, as that it becommeth to them their *Zenith* or Verticall Point. The reason hereof is, in that to the Inhabitants of such a Climate, the *Horizon* is coincident and one to the *Equinoctiall Circle*: and therefore seeing euery Diurnall Circle, which the Sunne maketh, is to the eye paralell to the *Equinoctiall*, and consequently to the *Horizon* of such a Climate, it followeth

that the *Horizon* doth not interſect any of the Diurnall Circles; and therefore the Sunne during all that tyme, neuer ſetteth to ſuch Inhabitants.

(f) *Founded the Earth:*] *Pſalm.* 23.

(g) *The Apoſtles definition*] *Heb.* c. 11. Where by the Apoſtle, Faith is defined to be; *The ſubſtance of things hoped for; the euidence of things not ſeene.* From which definition it appeareth, that our Sence cannot giue any Square & meaſure to our Faith.

(h) *Ecce qualibus*] *De Ciuitate Dei*, l. 22. c. 11.

(i) *Mainly Negatiue.*] For they deny Traditions, deny *Peters* Supremacy, deny Chriſts deſcending into Hell, deny Euangelicall Counſells, deny Purgatory and Prayer for the Dead, deny Iuſtification by Works, deny Free will: Finally (beſides many other points) deny the Reall Preſence of the Euchariſt, and Sacrifice of the Maſſe.

(k) *By Luther himſelfe:*] So teacheth *Luther* in his ſayinges alledged in Actis *Colloquij Altenburgenſis*. *Luther* further ſaith vpon the Galathians Engliſhed c. 2. *It is impiety to affirme, that faith, except it be adorned with Charity, iuſtifyeth not*: Yea he auoucheth *tom.* 1. *prop.* 3. *Fides niſi ſit fine &c. faith, except it be without the leaſt good works, doth not iuſtify, nay it is not faith.* And anſwerably hereto *Doctor Whitaker de Eccleſ. contra Bellarm. Controu.* 2. *quæſt.* 5. ſaith: *Nos dicimus, ſi quis actum fidei habeat, ei peccata non nocere: id quidem Lutherus affirmat, id nos omnes dicimus*: And *Illyricus in præfat. ad Roman.* In like ſort *Amſdorfius* a great Proteſtant ſaith: *Good works are not only not neceſſary to Saluation, but alſo hurtfull.* Finally, *Conradus Schluſſelburge* another Proteſtant *in Catalog. Hæret. l.* 11. *in Epiſtol. Dedicat.* will not admit good workes to be neceſſary to our Saluation, *neceſſitate præſentiæ* only.

(l) *By the Apoſtle.*] Philip. c. 2.

(m) *Biſhop of Ely.*] To wit moſt fully in the former place alledged in the Epiſtle to his Maieſty; Whoſe words ſhall heere be more largly recyted. Thus then he writeth in his Booke againſt Cardinall *Bellarmine cap.* 1. *Quod Cardinalem non latet, niſi nolintem & Virum, dixit Chriſtus, Hoc eſt Corpus meum: Non, Hoc modo, Hoc eſt Corpus meum. Nobis autem vobiſcum de Obiecto conuenit: de modo lis omnis eſt. De Hoc eſt, firmo fide tenemus: quod ſit de Hoc modo eſt (nempe Tranſubſtantiato in Corpus panē) de modo quo fiat, vt ſit Per, ſiue In, ſiue Cum, ſiue Sub, ſiue Trans, nullum nobis verbum eſt. Et quia verbum nullum, merito à fide ablegamus procul: inter ſcita ſchole forſaſſe, inter fidei articulos non ponimus &c.*

(n) *Monſieur Caſaubon: Cum ab omni curioſitate velit Rex*

ſuorum

suorum ingenia abstinent; quæcunq; tamen ij Patres primorum sæculorum ad commendationem ineffabilis Mysterij dixerunt, eaipse admittet. Patrum etiam Verba μετουσίωσιν, μεταποίησιν, μεταστοιχείωσιν, & similia, ex mente ipsorum suscipiantur, & exponantur, non reijciantur. Hæc Regia, & Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ doctrina. si vobis non satisfacit, nempe illud restat, vt Transubstantiationis dogma, quo vobis placuit, possit vti, approbet. Istud verò non est rei veritatem pie credere, sed importuna curiositate modum decernere. Thus *Monsieur Casaubon* in his Book to *Cardinall Peron*, besides many other like Passages.

(o) *Hierome saith.*] *Epist. ad Hedibiam. quæst. 2.*

(p) *Nourished without eating.*] To wit during Christs fast of forty dayes; He also did eate without nourishment, when he did eate with his Apostles after his Resurrection, for his body being then glorified, could not receaue any nourishment by meate.

(q) *Remayning visible.*] according to S. *Luke* 4. *Ipse transiens, per medium illorum ibat.*

(r) *The liquid Element.*] *Matth.* 14.

(s) *Latin Father.*] *S. Augustine tract. 26. in Ioannem*, expounding those words: *Panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est.*

THE CONTENTS OF THE CHAPTERS

of the first Part, wherin is proued the *Possibilitie* of the Catholike doctrine of the *Eucharist*.

THE Subiect of this Treatise. Chap. 1.

Of the Omnipotency of God, *and what he is able to performe.* Chap. 2.

The first Passage of the difficulties in the Blessed Eucharist explicated. Chap. 3.

The Second Passage of them explicated. Chap. 4.

The Third Passage of them explicated. Chap. 5.

The Difficulty of a Body being in diuers places at once, answered from more difficult Mysteries of the Trinity, *and the* Incarnation. Chap. 6.

The same answered by the like difficulty drawne from Eternity. Chap. 7.

The same answered from the Vbiquity of God, *acknowledged by*

by all Christians. Chap. 8.
The difficultyes of a Body wanting Circumscription of Place, and of an Accident without a Subiect, explayned by the difficultyes discovered in the power of Seeing, *and the Circumstances thereof.* Chap. 9.

The Contents of the Chapters of the secõd Part, wherin is proued the Doctrine of the *Reall Presence*, and *Transubstantiation* in the Eucharist.

THE *Catholike doctrine of the Eucharist proued from the* Figures *of the Old Testament; from the* Prophesyes *of the Rabbyns; from the* New Testament; *frõ* Miracles; *from the first beginning of the Sacramentaries doctrine &c.* Chap. 1.
That the Ancient Fathers taught our Catholike doctrine; and first of such their Testimonies, as concerne their appellations, *and naming of the Eucharist.* Chap. 2.
Of the Fathers Authoritye, touching the Chang *made in the Eucharist, from whence is demonstrated the doctrine of* Transubstantiation. Chap. 3.
Of their Authoritye, contayning their Comparisons *of the Eucharist with other Mysteries.* Chap. 4.
Of their Authoritye confessing the inexplicable Greatnes *of this Mystery.* Chap. 5.
Of their Authoritye expressing the Effect *of the Eucharist, and the* Veneration *exhibited to the same.* Chap. 6.
Of their Authoritye, shewing that the Celebration of the Eucharist contayneth a proper and true Sacrifice; *from which doctrine*

doctrine (as from all the other Heads of their Testimonies) is necessarily euicted and proued the doctrine of the Reall Presence. Chap. 7.

Of the diuers manners of the Protestants Euasions *and* Answeres *to the Authorityes of the Fathers.* Chap. 8.

That all the chiefe obiected Authorityes of the Fathers, vrged by our Aduersaries, are impertinent. Chap. 9.

That by the Confessions *of the most* Learned Protestants, *the Fathers do teach the Reall Presence, and Transubstantiation.* Chap. 10.

Of certayne Considerations drawne from Luther, *the* Lutherans, *and other Protestants, concerning the doctrine of the Eucharist.* Chap. 11.

That there are many Congruentiall Reasons, *shewing the conueniency why Christ might be induced to leaue his Body and Bloud in the Eucharist to vs Christians; as also the Conueniency of the manner of Transubstantiation.* Chap. 12.

The Conclusion. Chap. 13.

BRITISH 8 JU86 MUSEUM

THE

THE CHRISTIANS MANNA.

THE FIRST TRACT.

The subiect of this Treatise.

CHAP. I.

(a) *ALTITVDO diuitiarum Sapientiæ, & Scientiæ Dei!* Thus did that b) Heauen-rapt Apostle burst forth into admiration of Gods vnsearchable Wisdome, through the contemplation of his will and pleasure, whereby he was moued to draw some out of that heauy and dreadfull masse of damnation, caused through the all-spreading fall of our first Parents, as also to leaue therin

therin others (no more interessed in the fault of *Adam*, then the rest) Vessells and Vassalls of wrath, and thrall to eternall perdition: And thus may we Catholikes haue no lesse reason to admire the inscrutable Wisdome, and Goodnesse of the said diuine Maiesty, if we enter into consideration of diuers Articles of Faith, taught by the Catholike Church, and believed by her obedient Children; to see how far some of them are estranged from all humane Prudence, and how far discosted others do lye from the reach of Mans capacity. And to particularize this in some Examples, we find, that answerably hereto it was our Sauiours good pleasure among all the Apostles to institute him, as Head of the rest, who openly forsooke his Lord and Maister, and after increased his sinne of Abnegation, with the aggrauating circumstance of Periury: So as *Iesus* thought it best in the abyssmall depth of his Wisdome, to build the Confession of Faith vpon the deniall of Faith, and to appoint him, who disclaimed in Christ, to be the future Anchor and stay of all those, who should after trust in Christ.

In like sort the Sacraments (which are ordained to be certaine conduits, & passages, wherby to deryue into Mans soule Gods grace) do consist of externall signes, or formes, wherein the stupendious wonder is (though I grant (c) some congruentiall reasons may be giuen therof) to obserue, that things materiall, and sensible are ordayned to sanctify our immateriall & spirituall soules, where through the action of them, being in their very vse (d) eleuated aboue themselues, & transceding their owne worth, and dignity, they produce spirituall, & celestiall Effects. Thus we see, that things not capable of sense (much lesse of Grace) cause that in another, which themselues

ſelues enioy not; like the Sunne which animateth the inferiour Bodies with heate, and life, and yet it ſelfe not (e) hauing either heate or life.

But now if we turne our Pen more particulerly to the moſt Bleſſed, & Reuered Sacrament of the *Euchariſt* (where the Word being made Fleſh, by his Word, made Bread Fleſh) we ſhalbe able to diſcouer whole ſeas of wonders, and be forced to acknowledge, that Mans vnderſtanding is not of force to ſound them, or that it beſt apprehendeth them, in not apprehending them (ſtill bearing an obſequious, and inuolued beliefe of what Gods Church teacheth therin) no otherwiſe then the Memory often ſerues to remember, that ſome things it did not remember.

Now ſeeing it is my intended Method to ſpend this firſt Part in explicating, and vnfoulding our Aduerſaries greateſt, and ſtrongeſt difficulties which they vſe, as ſo many *Arietes*, or Engines, to ruinate and batter downe the walles of the ancient Catholike doctrine therin: All which though they ſhalbe fully reconciled, & explaned, ſo as our vnderſtanding ſhalbe conuinced of the poſſibility therof (and conſequently that Chriſt was able to exhibite his Body truly, and really vnder the formes of Bread, and wine) yet neuertheleſſe, the externall betraying Senſe (the alluring Eue, entiſing our Vnderſtanding, the proper ſeate of Faith, to giue aſſent to it owne danger) will ſtill be whiſpering in our eares the contrary doctrine. Therfore I haue thought good to premoniſh the Reader in the entrance hereof, that in this Myſtery he is to relinquiſh all entercourſe with Senſe, & to ſtand in hoſtility with the ſame; yea euen forcing, and conſtrayning his Vnderſtanding to receaue no intelligence

from thence; and euer to remember, that he who first made the Eye, still retaines a commaund ouer the Eye. Thus violence, only in enioying of him, who forbiddeth all violence, is warrantable (for not only touching life, but faith also) (f) *Regnum Cælorum vim patitur*, and heere rapine is true purchase: so in all other things, for vsing of force we are punished, heere for not vsing we are punished.

(a) *O Altitudo diuitiarum.*] Rom. c. 11.

(b) *That heauen-rapt Apostle.*] viz. *S. Paul*, who 2. Cor. 12. saith of himselfe: *I know a man euen rapt to the third Heauen.*

(c) *Some congruentiall Reasons.*] Among diuers other Reasons, this is the chiefest: That seeing Man aswell consists of a corporall Substance, as of a spirituall Substance (the Soule) therfore our Sauiour thought it conuenient, that the Sacraments should consist of materiall, and externall signes, or formes, answerable to the nature of our Bodies, and so externally working vpon the Body internally, and spiritually, they worke vpon the Soule, according to that saying of Tertullian lib. de resurrect. Carnis. *Caro abluitur, vt anima emaculetur; Caro inungitur, vt anima consecretur; Caro corpore, & sanguine Christi vescitur, vt anima de Deo saginetur.*

(d) *Eleuated aboue themselues.*] The manner how the Sacraments do worke in Mans Iustification, being not the Conclusion it selfe betweene the Protestants, and vs, but a circumstance only of the Conclusion, is disputable, and not a point of Faith, and therfore is seuerally defended by the School-men. For some of them do teach, that the Sacraments, are *Causæ morales* of our Iustification, euen as he is the true cause of a Mans death, who comaundeth the Man to be killed, though himselfe do not touch the Man. Thus doth *Scotus*, *Durand*, *Bonauenture*, & others hould. But the more probable opinion is that of *S. Thomas* 3. part. quæst. 62. art. 4. who teacheth, that the Sacraments are *Causæ efficientes Physicæ, & Instrumentales* of our Iustification, and that the vertue heere infused by God, is not any new inherent quality, either spirituall or corporall, but only the Motion, & vse of God therein: for in that God doth vse this Sacramentall action to produce Grace, he doth eleuate the same action, & maketh it to beget a supernaturall effect, the which effect it could not, if it were mo-

ued

ued by any other then God.

(e) *Not hauing either heate.*] The Distinction which the Philosophers do heere vse, is, that the Sunne, and other Heauenly Bodies, haue heate, and other such qualities *per productionem, non per inhærentiam*, that is, they cause the same qualities in other Bodies, (and so may be said to haue them) but these qualities do not inhere in the said heauenly Bodies; for these *primæ qualitates* are originally peculiar, and naturall to the Elements only, and to other Bodies compounded of them, by participation. But the Heauens are not compound of the Elements.

(f) *Regnum Cælorum.*] Matth. c. 11.

OF THE OMNIPOTENCY OF GOD.

AND

What he is able to performe.

CHAP. II.

THE ſmall ſtreames, wherewith the floud of the Sacramentarian Hereſie is fed, and maintained, ſpring chiefly from the extenuating of Gods omnipotency: intimating therby, that the abſtruſe Myſteries which are confeſſedly acknowledged by the Catholikes to be in the Reall Preſence, are greater, then can be performed by that power, which through it infinitneſſe is euer vnknowne, though through it continuall manifeſtatiõ, ſtill eminent. In this manner doth that (a) firſt French *Apoſtata*, & that late (b) Patriarch of *Geneua* diſpute of this matter.

matter. In like sort that (c) *false Martyr* (who with the Apostle of his owne name denied his Maister, but neuer with him lamented his denyall) laboured to shorten Gods arme, and omnipotency heerin: so ready are these great Rabbins to interleague, & compart with the very Heathens in depressing of his might, whose Greatnesse is without (d) *Quantity*, whose Goodnesse without *Quality*, and whose Eternity without *Tyme*..

But before we vndertake to shew the possibility of all such points, as are found in this Mystery of the Eucharist, it will much conduce (I suppose) to our intended proiect, if we lay downe the graue iudgments of the learned, concerning what things be factible, or may be done by God, and what things may seeme to transcend his might, who in might transcendeth all things: since so the impartiall Reader may the better obserue, whether the acknowledged doubts in the Eucharist imply in themselues any absolute impossibility, or no.

First then it is generally agreed vpon by the Learned, that God is able to do euery thing, which Mans vnderstanding is able to conceaue. The reason hereof being, that since the Obiect of our mind is *Ens*, and *Verum* in generall, and that which may be conceaued or vnderstood, may really & truly exist: Therfore it followeth, that God can effect all that, which Man is able to conceaue in his Mind.

Secondly, the Learned (especially those which are Christians) affirme, that not only those things, which Man is able to apprehend in his mind, but also many other things incomprehensible in Mans vnderstanding, God can effect. For seeing (say they) that *totum Ens* of it selfe is intelligible, and to be conceaued, and that which

is *non Ens* cannot be conceaued; neuertheleſſe our Vnderſtanding through it weakneſſe, and imbecillity (except it be cleared with the Light of Grace) is often deceaued in cõceauing of thiñgs, & ſuppoſeth many things cannot exiſt, or be (and conſequently not to be apprehended by our Vnderſtanding, or in themſelues to be factible) which may indeed exiſt, and ſo become the obiect of our Mind. Thus our Vnderſtanding may apprehend, that ſome things there are, which it cannot apprehend: neuertheleſſe the more the vnderſtanding doth lift it ſelfe vp towards God, the more it is illuminated, and the better refined for the penetrating of any difficultie; no otherwiſe then a vapour the higher it is eleuated vp by the Sunne, the more cleare, and purified it becomes. This doctrine of theirs, as it is warrantable in the Authority of Gods ſacred word, ſo is it iuſtifiable in diuers exemplified Articles of our Faith, which the Heathen Philoſophers eſteemed, as things impoſſible, and by deniall therof aſcribed vnto God, only a kind of impotent Omnipotency.

Thirdly, they teach, that God hath in all things ſo much an *Actiue Power*, by how much they haue in themſelues a *Paſſiue Power*: And in this ſenſe perhaps the Heathen Philoſophers acknowledged Gods Omnipotency. But their Errour was, in that they thought, that the *Actiue Power* of God could not extend beyond the *Paſſiue Power* of things (thus we ſee it verified in theſe learned men, (e) *That the world through wiſdome knew not God*) wheras all Chriſtian Philoſophers do teach the cõtrary: and therfore they belieue, that God could, & did create the world of *Nothing*. Now to make a thing of *Nothing*, is not to depend, and rely in any ſort of the *Paſſiue Power*

of

of the Subiect, since in this kind of producing there was no preexistent subiect at all, much lesse any Passiue power thereof.

Fourthly, they further proceed, and affirme, that God can doe all things, which can by any meanes exist, agreeably to that of our Sauiour, *Omnia (f.) tibi possibilia sunt*: Now all that may exist, which in it owne nature implyeth a Being only, and not a Not-being And from hence proceedeth that common Axiome of Deuines: *That euery thing is possible to God to be done, which implieth not a contradiction*: Now what implyeth a contradiction, is impossible to be done. And the reason heerof is in that, what implyeth a contradiction supposeth a *Being*, and a *Not-being* of a thing, and all this at one time: and therfore if such a thing could be, then could a thing be, whose *Being* should consist in a *Not-being*. Now only that, which hath no Being cannot be effected by God; since euery thing that is, ought in some sort to be like to him, of whome it is. Besides to make that which is not, and hath no Being, is not to make, but rather a *Not-making*, to the which, not any Power, but an Impotency belongeth; which Impotency can in no sort be assigned to his Diuine Maiesty, who only is weak, in not being able to be weake. Thus is his mighty Arme shortened in deficiency, but extended in strength, since to him it is more easy to do, then not to do. And thus we teach, that he is not able to make *Nothing*, who yet of *Nothing* made all things. And therfore answerably hereto (because God is not capable of any defect) we say, God cānot dye, because *Death* is formally *non Ens* (besides, that true Diuinity is impatible.) By the same reason we affirme, that God cannot sinne, since the power

required to *Sinne*, is only a want of Power, though powerfully raigning in Man. So free is he from all such weakneſſe, ſince he ſheweth himſelfe moſt Omnipotent, in being herein not Omnipotent.

And thus much of theſe foure points, which are (as it were) foure graduall ſteps, wherby Mans Vnderſtanding may climbe vp, to ſee how far Gods Power may extend it ſelfe; or ſo many high Turrets (from whence our ſoule, ouerlooking the low, and beaten paths of Nature) may with an inward reflexe view the boundleſſe, and vaſt heights of Gods infinite Might, and Puiſſance: The vſe wherof is, that the Reader may make application of this doctrine to the difficulties of the Bleſſed Sacrament, and ſo ſee, if any of them (according to the former rules) may imply any Impoſſibility, or noe. For though we graunt, that many things therin do tranſcend the created courſe of Nature; yet neuertheleſſe, God (who is Natures *Nature*) is able at his pleaſure to diſioint the ſetled frame therof; and therfore heere appeareth the great Indignity, which theſe Idolaters of Nature (I mean the Sectaries of this Tyme, who impugne the doctrine of the Euchariſt, namely, becauſe it is repugnant to naturall Reaſon) do offer vnto God, in ſeeking to confine his force within the narrow lymits of Nature; as if the precincts therof were the *Herculean Pillar*, beyond which his Omnipotency (which is only bounded within a boundleſſe compaſſe) cannot paſſe: So apt theſe Men are to breath out blaſphemies againſt him, through whome they breath, & to ſpeake in diſhonour of him, in whome they ſpeake.

(a) *French*

(a) *French Apostata.*] viz. *Caluin*, who saith. l. 4. Instit. c. 17. *Cur inquiunt* (viz. Catholici) *non faciat Deus, vt caro eadem plura diuersaq; loca occupet, vt nullo loco contineatur, vt forma & specie careat? Insane, quid à Dei potentia postulas, vt carnem faciat, simul esse, & non esse carnem?*

(b) *Late Patriarch.*] viz. *Beza*, lib. de Cœna Domini contra Westphalum.

(c) *False Martyr.*] *Peter Martyr*, lib. contra Gardinerum. obiect. 10. 11. 12. &c.

(d) *Without Quantity*] The hauing of Accidences euer implyes composition: therfore God being most simple, can haue no Accidences.

(e) *That the world.*] 1. *Cor.* c. 1.

(f) *Omnia tibi.*] *Marc.* 14.

THE FIRST PASSAGE OF THE MYSTERIES AND *other difficulties of the Euchariſt.*

CHAP. III.

BVT now at the laſt to come to thoſe great difficulties, which preſent themſelues in the Bleſſed Sacrament. I will touch them in theſe three Paſſages following, which ſhalbe accompanied with their Marginal References, conteyning the explication, and vnfolding of them. Which Obſcurities (euen for the more aduantage to our Sectaryes) I haue ſet downe in ſeeming Contradictions, that being thus deliuered in the fulleſt ſhew of Impoſſibilityes, if they can be ſolued; then no doubt

doubt, but being more neerly, & not so litteraly weighed, they may the more easely be reconcyled.

But now since in an erring and mistaking Eye, they may appeare meere Repugnances, I haue thought good therefore (once more, this second tyme) to forwarne our Aduersaryes (for their former sleights with other Mens labours do presage their like dealing heerin, if full preuention and caution be not made afore) that they do not diuulge to their followers (lesse capable of such nice speculations) the bare difficultyes alone, as here they lye, concealing their Explications drawne from Philosophy and Diuinity, and so traducing vs (though most falsly) as mantayners of most euident and irreconciliable contradictoryes: but that they would vouchsafe withall to take notice of their Marginall illustrations; and so either to relate them both togeather, or to passe them ouer togeather, since this deportment is best sorting to the candor & integrity of an ingenuous and well-meaning Aduersary.

And first if we looke into the stupendious, and miraculous Conuersion made therein, we shall discouer these points following.

We shall find it to be a (a) *Change* of one thing into another, and yet contrary to all other conuersions whatsoeuer, nothing of that thus altered (b) remaining, nor any other thing (c) produced of new: and therefore we may truly say, the Bread was, but is not; is Nothing, and yet (d) not annihilated.

A *Change*, which is caused by a (e) Successiue pronouncing of seuerall words; and yet wrought in an (f) instant. A *Change*, wherein the Priest may be said of Bread (g) to make the Body of Christ; & yet the Priest maketh

maketh not the Body of Christ.

A Change, wherein the Body being made (h) of Bread (a thing farre different from flesh) is the very same, which was made of the flesh of the Queene of Heauen. *A Change*, where, by the force of Consecration the Body is without Bloud; and yet euen then the Body is (i) not without Bloud. In like sort by the same vertue, the *Humanity* of Christ is only intended, and yet (k) his *Diuinity*, which is euer (l) in all places, is (*) heere of new, truly, and really exhibited.

A Change, where the Body of our Sauiour is present, and yet (m) represented. *A Change*, whereby that sacred Body, at the first Institution of the *Eucharist*, being yet mortall, and passible, was then receaued, as (n) immortall, and impassible. *A Change*, where the externall formes of the things changed, doe by themselues after a sort (o) subsist, and yet are not substances; they inhere not, and yet are Accidents: they are in themselues in respect of *negation*, and not of *position*; in another by way of *preseruation*, not of *inherency*.

A Change, whereby, the Testament made, being Christs (p) Bloud, was yet sealed in his Bloud.

A Change, where the (q) externall Formes being corrupted, a new substantiall Forme is introduced, and yet heere is no Generation; it is not produced out of any preexistent Matter, and yet no Creation; it is exhibited immediately, and only by God, and yet without any new Miracle.

To conclude, *A Change* (see heere repose in Motiõ) wrought without Change, since the Body of our Sauiour suffered no alteration therby; for it (r) relinquished nothing, which afore it had; but acquired some things, which

which afore it had not. Thus though, what he heere is, he was not; yet what he was, he heere is.

Now out of this Passage it appeareth, how the *Catholikes* dissent herein, both from the *Lutherans*, & from the *Sacramentaries*. From the Lutherans, for though they acknowledge the true presence of Christs Body in the *Eucharist*, yet they teach, that no reall Change is made of the Bread into the Body, but a Consubstantiall coexistency of both: which opinion, though resting only in the manner of the Conclusion, we repute no lesse then Heresy; since in points doctrinall (once (o) definitiuely true, or false) who erreth litle, erreth much.

We also dissent from the Sacramentaries, who relying altogeather vpon their sense herein (like *Labans* sheep led mainly by their Eye) do inforce an impossibility of our Doctrine; whereas Faith assureth vs, that the Body of Christ is heere really exhibited. And therefore we teach, that the vnderstanding (which is in this place the Eye to the Eye) though borrowing all knowledge from Sense, euen in knowledge heere controles Sense, and secureth vs, that his Sacred Body, and Bloud (through the vertue of his owne speaches) is heere really present; though (through the dignity thereof) veyled ouer from our sight, and yet not veyled ouer with any thing, since they are not (t) things, but formes, vnder which it lieth. Thus against the Sacramentaries we hold it most cleare, that heere to peruert Christs words, is to impugne Christs power.

(a) *A Change*] This Conuersion is not wrought by any assumption of Bread to the *Person* of the *Word*: Nor by any locall, and

and simple vnion of the Bread with the Body: Nor by any partiall change of the Bread into the Body; but is an entire, and whole conuersion of the Substance of Bread, and wine into the Body, and Bloud of Christ.

(b) *Remayning.*] In all naturall Conuersions, the *Materia prima* of the thing conuerted, remaineth vnder both the *Termini* of the Conuersion, and by the Conuersion this *Materia prima* is inuested only with a new essentiall forme: so when water is turned into ayre, the *Materia prima* of water remaineth, and is not altered, but only taketh the forme of ayre. But heere the *Materia prima* of Bread and wyne doth not remaine, and therefore the *Councell of Trent* teacheth, that the Conuersion is made of the whole substance of Bread, and wyne, meaning thereby both of the matter, and forme thereof.

(c) *Produced of new.*] In naturall Conuersions, that into which any thing is changed, is produced of new: for the *Terminus ad quem*, not afore existing, but only by vertue of the change, must be of necessity produced of new; and this Conuersion is called by Philosophers *Conuersio productiua*. But heere in the *Eucharist* the Body of Christ preexisting afore the Conuersion, though not vnder the *Species*, or forme of Bread, doth cause that the Conuersion heere maketh, not that the Body of Christ should simply begin to be, but only, that it should begin of new to be vnder the forme of Bread.

(d) *Not annihilated.*] Because, as it is aboue said, *the Materia prima* of bread remaineth not: the Bread is nothing; and yet the bread is not annihilated: for *Annihilation* is an action, which terminateth, and endeth in *Nothing*; but this action in the *Eucharist*, by the which the bread ceaseth to be, doth not terminate in nothing, but in something, to witt, in the body of Christ.

(e) *Successiue*]. The words of Consecration are the cause of this conuersion, and therefore this conuersion is not made without a true successiue pronouncing of the said words.

(f) *Instant.*] Though all the words successiuely pronounced doe worke this Conuersion, yet the said words haue no perfect signification (and consequently causeth not the change) till the last instant, wherein the last word is pronounced: for in that last instant, and not before, the effect of the words doe really, and truly exist; that is, the Conuersion of Bread into the Body of Christ, and of the wine into his Bloud. The like difficulty we find in the words of Baptisme, which produce no effect till the last Instant. Now heere it is to be obserued, that though the signification of the words, and the Conuersion be perfected togather in one instant, yet in ordes of

Nature

Nature they reciprocally precede, and follow one the other; for as the truth of this Proposition, *This is my Body*, depends *de rei essentia*, of the essence, or being of the thing touched in this Proposition, so the Conuersion doth precede the signification of the words: but as those words are the Cause of the Conuersion, so the words precede the Conuersion.

(g) *To make.*] In a sober construction the Priest may be said to make the Body of Christ, in that by his only (and no lay persons) pronouncing of the wordes of Consecration, the bread is really turned into the Body of Christ; and in this sense the Ancient Fathers doe most frequently teach, that the Priest maketh the Body of Christ: See *Cyprian l. 2. epist. 2. & 9. & lib. 3. epist. 15. Athanasius 2. Apolog. contra Arianos. Basil. l. 2. de Baptism. c. 3. Chrysostome l. 3, & 6. de Sacerdotio. Hierome lib. contra Luciferianos.* Now though the Fathers in this their peculiar sense were accustomed to write so, in regard, that none could consecrate, but a Priest: yet if we will speake in precise termes, the Priest maketh not the Body of Christ, because Christs Body being afore, the Priest by his words doth not produce it of new, but only causeth it to be vnder those externall formes of Bread and wine, vnder which afore it was not.

(h) *Of Bread.*] The Body of Christ may be said to be made of Bread, because the Bread is truly, and really conuerted into his Body, though the Body doth truly exist before any such Conuersion. And in this sense diuers ancient Fathers doe write, that the Body of Christ is made of Bread: *Cyprian* saith *Serm. de Cœna Domini: Panis iste, quem Dominus Discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed natura mutatus, omnipotentia Dei factus est caro.*] *Gaudentius* tract. 2. de Exodo. *Ipse naturarum Creator, & Dominus, qui producit de terra panem, de pane rursus, quia & potest, & promisit, efficit proprium corpus: & qui de aqua vinum fecit, de vino sanguinem suum facit.*] S. *Augustine* in his Sermon cited by *S. Bede* vpon the tenth chapter of the first to the Corinthians saith: *Non omnis Panis, sed accipiens benedictionem Christi, fit Corpus Christi.*] so vsuall, and obuious was this phrase with the ancient Fathers, which is so harsh to the curious eares of our new Brethren.

(i) *Not without Bloud.*] The reason hereof is, because Christ is there whole vnder either of the externall formes, in regard of the naturall vnion of his soule with his Body, which vnion is neuer more to be dissolued, since he is neuer more to die. But if his Body should be without Bloud, then should it be a dead Body, and consequently himselfe were hereafter to die againe, contrary to that of the Apostle *Rom. 6. Christus resurgens ex mortuis, iam non moritur: mors illi vltra*

non dominabitur.

(k) *His Diuinity.*] The Humanity of Christ is euer accompanied with the Diuinity, and therfore his Humanity being in the Sacrament by force of Consecration, his Diuinity is also there with it *per concomitantiam*, as the Deuines do speake. Now, that where the Body of Christ is, there the Diuinity of Christ must be also, is proued from this Principle of Faith: to witt, That Christ is one diuine Person subsisting in two natures, and therefore whersoeuer the Body of Christ is, it can haue no other then a diuine subsistence, which subsistence is the same in matter with the diuine Essence. So as we see by force of the *Hypostaticall vnion* (which is neuer to be dissolued) where the Body of Christ is, there the Diuinity is also.

(l) *In all places.*] If the Diuinity of God were not in all places, then should it be circumscriptible, or at least, definitiue in place, and consequently not Infinite; & then it were no true Diuinity.

(*) *Here of new.*] In like sort all do grant, that the Diuinity of Christ was in the wombe of the B. Virgin before her Conception; and yet the Diuinity was there (after another manner) at the time of her Conception.

(m) *Represented.*] It may be said to be represented. First, because the externall formes of Bread, and wyne doe represent the Body of Christ, as it dyed vpon the Crosse, and the Bloud, as it was shed vpon the crosse: for the Eucharist is a commemoration of the Passion of Christ, according to those words of *S. Paul* 1. Cor. 11. *Mortem Domini annunciabitis, donec veniat.* And in this respect his Body may be said to be represented in the Eucharist, because it is not there after the same manner, as it was vpon the Crosse, but only by similitude: and in this sense *Augustine epist.* 23. *ad Bonifacium*, is to be vnderstood, where he saith: *Secundum quendam modum, Sacramenta Corporis Christi, Corpus Christi est.* Secondly it is said to be represented, or in figure, because the externall formes of Bread, and wyne, are the signes of the Body, and Bloud of Christ there present, though veyled ouer with those formes. And thus is *S. Basil* to be vnderstood in sua Liturgia, who calles the Eucharist Ἀντίτυπον, a *Figure*, or *Representation* of the Body of Christ. And in this sense all the Sacraments of the new Law, may be called Figures, or Representations, because they are externall signes representing, and withall working an inward Grace.

(n) *Immortal.*] For as it was at the first deliuered to the Apostles, it was in that spirituall manner vnder the externall formes, as now it is after his death.

(o) *After a sort subiect.*] The Accidentes of Bread, and

Wine

Wine are said to be in themselues, because they are not *in aliquo supposito*, or subiect, and yet they do not truly subsist by any positiue act, but are *in Corpore Christi*, as they are preserued there, though not by way of inherencie. Now, where our Aduersaries do vsually obiect, that it is of the essence of an Accident to inhere in the Subiect, and therfore the Accidences of Bread, & Wine, must either inhere in the body of Christ, which all Catholikes deny, or else in the bread and wine, and consequently no Transubstantiation: I answere hereto, that all chiefe Philosophers deny it to be of the essence of an Accident: for *Aristotle* himselfe, *lib. 3. de Anima text. 9.* saith: *Aliud est magnitudo, aliud magnitudinis esse*: Now, if the *existence* of an Accident be distinguished from its *essence*: much more is the *inherency* thereof, which is but the manner of its *existency*. Besides if Inherency were of the essence of an Accident, *Aristotle* would neuer haue demaunded *4. Physic. text. 58.* whether that space were supposed to be *vacuum*, where there should be only sound, and colour, intimating thereby, that though by naturall Reason, an Accident cannot exist without a subiect, yet that inherency is not of the essence of colour, or sound; since otherwise his demaund should be absurd, and idle; for who should suppose Colour or Sound, would necessarily presuppose a subiect, and therfore a Body.

(p) *Christs Bloud.*] As the Bloud of Christ is taken for that Bloud which was in the Chalice vnder the externall species of wine, so it is a Sacrament, and consequently a Will, or Testament. But as his Bloud is taken for that Bloud, which was shed vpon the Crosse: so is his Testament sealed, and established in the same Bloud. And therfore according to this double acception of Christs Bloud, we find, that S. Luke did speake in these words: *Hic Calix nouum Testamentum in sanguine meo*, where by the word *Calix*, is meant Bloud, and consequently the Testament.

(q) *Externall Formas.*] We hold, that when the Externall Species are corrupted, the same substantiall Forme succeeds, which would naturally haue succeeded, if the Bread, and Wine had not bene changed into the Body, and Bloud of Christ. And yet we teach not, that this commeth by any *Generation*, for in euery *Generation* there is *eadem materia numero* vnder both the *Termini*, or Formes, which heere is not; for the same *Materia prima* which was in the Body of Christ, is not in the new introduced forme. Now then, though it doth not proceed from any preexistent Matter, yet it cannot be said to be Created: for *Creation* properly hath no reference, or relation (as proceeding meerly of *Nothing*) to any former thing whatsoeuer; but heere this new forme hath a necessary relation, and dependency of the

corruption of the former ſpecies of bread, and wine: for if the ſaid formes were not, and after became not corrupted, this new ſubſtantiall forme would not ſucceed. Laſtly we teach, that this new ſubſtance is ſubſtituted, or brought in by God, euen in that very Inſtant, when the Formes of Bread, and Wine ceaſe to be. And this neuertheleſſe is not accompliſhed by any ſecond and new Miracle: for euen as when the matter of a Mans Bodie being ſufficiently diſpoſed, God doth immediately create and infuſe the ſoule, and yet this is not called a Miracle, becauſe the order of things already ſet downe by God, doth require it. In like ſort, when the alteration of the ſpecies of Bread, & Wine is proceeded ſo far, that then are made preſent requiſite diſpoſitions (as the courſe of things requires) to introduce ſome forme, then doth God in that very inſtant miniſter the matter, and ſo the ſubſtantiall forme is introduced. Now heere we are to note, that when any part of theſe formes are corrupted, the Body of Chriſt either in whole, or in part is not extinct therby, but only ceaſeth to be vnder thoſe corrupted formes, ſtill continuing whole vnder the reſt not corrupted, and if all the formes be corrupted, then it ceaſeth to be there at all, not much otherwiſe, then when a Mans Leg is cut off, the ſoule which was in the Leg, dyeth not (for if it dyed, then he who wanted a leg, ſhould want a part of his ſoule) but only ceaſeth to informe that part, informing all the reſt: and if all parts of the Body were diſioynted aſunder, then the Soule not dying, ceaſeth only to informe any of the ſaid parts.

(r) *Relinquiſhed Nothing.*] For Chriſts Body in the Sacrament enioyeth all thoſe eſſentiall perfections of a true Body, which afore it had in Heauen, only it receaueth a new relation to the ſpecies of Bread, and Wine, as it is in the Sacrament, which it hath not as it is in Heauen, and conſequently it is inueſted thereby with ſome other circumſtances accompanying that it exiſtence vnder it ſpecies, as to be freed from all extenſion of place, as alſo to be freed from that relation of place, which it hath, as it is in Heauen.

(s) *Definitiuely.*] For the *Generall Councell of Lateran* vnder *Innocentius* the third defined for an Article of Faith the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* (though this doctrine was generally believed afore) in the firſt Chapter of the Decrees of that Councell. He therfore that reiecteth the authority of a lawfull Councell, reiecteth the authority of Gods Church, and conſequently his Errour (though reſting but in the manner, or circumſtance of any queſtion) cannot be ſmall, ſince in ſuch his Errour is included his greater Errour, in thinking, that a true and lawfull Generall Councell may definitiuely, and ſententially erre.

(t) *Are not things.*) The Philosophers do teach, that *Substantia* only, are truly and perfectly *Entia*. And that *Accidentia*, are only *Analogicè Entia*, being in their owne nature imperfect. And thus in this sense the Accidents of Bread, and Wine (vnder which the Body and Bloud of our Sauiour lye) may be truly tearmed *Non Entia*.

THE SECOND PASSAGE.

CHAP. IIII.

BVT let vs passe on to the difficulties of another nature. We find, that Christs Body by force of those operatiue words, is in diuers places, & Churches at one, and the same time: for though Christ be incircumscriptibly in the Sacrament, yet we teach, that as a Body by Gods power may want all (a) Circumscription; so by the same power it may haue diuers (b) Circumscriptions; much more then may it be at once in diuers places Sacramentally, since (c) Vnity of Essence, and Nature is not dissolued by diuersity of place. Hence is it, that it may be neere (d) to the Earth, and remote from the same; moued, and not moued; remaining vpon the Altar, and receaued by the Communicant, and all at one, and the same time. And yet if the same Body (supposing it were patible) be in one place wounded, it would also be found (e) wounded in another, for Nature keeps

keeps her certaine bounds, euen in transgressing her bounds.

Thus answerably hereto we teach, that it may be in a place, wherein before it was not; and yet neither through any Locall (f) motion (for it neuer leaueth Heauen) nor by any Generation, for afore it was. It is not (g) continued with the same Body being in another place, nor yet discontinued, or deuided from the same; and yet neither is the Body multiplied, or doubled, nor the places confounded. Briefly it is heere vpon Earth, & yet it leaueth not (h) Heauen; and euen then it enioyeth a perfect (i) neerenesse to it self in so great a distance. Thus through it being in such distance, & diuersity of places, it seemeth to (k) transcend, and through it being contained vnder a small hoast, to lessen it owne naturall, and true Quantity, and yet is the Quantity (l) euer one, and the same.

Furthermore we see, that this sacred body by force of Consecration, inioyeth the Being in diuers places, which it obtaineth not by vertue of Hypostaticall, and inseparable vnion with the *Diuinity*, which is in all places. For though by this vnion, the *Diuinity*, and *Humanity* is made but one *Person*, and (this *Person* being an (m) Individuall Substance) the *Humanity* (wherein is) doth euer (n) accompany the *Diuinity*, which is in all places; yet we teach not, that the *Humanity* is in all places. Neither may it be inferred hereupon, that the *Word* is somewhere *Man*, somewhere (o) not *Man*. Thus we reiect that phantasie of *Luthers* Vbiquity, as ouerthrowing many Mysteries (p) of our Faith, and retaying ouermuch leauen of *Eutyches* his Heresie, to easily will a *Lutheran* transplanted, grow vp a perfect *Eutychian*. And thus much of *Luthers* errour herein, in this pro-

gressius:

gressiue digression.

Now heere we are to note, that the difficulties in this Passage sway much the iudgements of our sensible, and materiall Christians (for so I may well style them, since they measure their faith by the *Lesbian Square* of their Sense.) And therefore in regard thereof, I haue thought good, in two or three subsequent Chapters, (sepосed only to this end) to exemplify the said difficulty of multiplicity of places, in other points acknowledged, and confessed by our Aduersaries. Wherefore I could wish, that when they doe looke vpon the Mysteries of Christian Religion, they would shut the Eye of Sense, and Naturall Reason; since so they might (no doubt) by seeing the lesse, be able to see the more; and be like herein to that great Apostle, who by loosing his Eyes, obtained Light.

(a) *Vpon all Circumscription.*] See the explication of this difficulty hereafter in the next Passage at the letter D.

(b) *Diuers Circumscriptions.*] A Body may by Gods Power haue at one time diuers Circumscriptions: which is, to haue seuerall places extensiuely. And the reason hereof is, because that only implies a contradiction (and consequently, as we touched afore, cannot be done by God) which impugnes the very essence of a thing, so as it doth presuppose a Being, and a Not-Being of the said thing. But to be in place, or in diuers places at once, is extrinsecall, and accidentary, and not of the Essence: but what is extrinsecall, or Accidentary, is *posterius*, and later then the thing it selfe, and consequently by Gods Omnipotency may be deuided from the nature, and essence thereof. The proofe of this doctrine is also deduced from the example of our Sauiour, who neuer leauing Heauen, appeared to S. *Paul* vpon the Earth, as we read *Act.* c. 9. & 22. That it was not any voice (which spake to him) made by Gods Power, or the ministery of the Angells only (as some doe answere) but our Sauiour himselfe, appeareth: both because mention being made hereof in diuers places of the Acts, it

it euer toucheth *Pauls* seeing of Christ in his owne Person. So we read *Act*. c. 22. That *Ananias* put *Paul* in remembrance of his seeing of Christ. In like sort c. 26. Christ himselfe saith, That he appeared to him, thereby to make him a witnesse of the things, which he saw, but he could not be a witnesse thereof (especially of the Resurrection) except he had truly, and really seene the very Body of Christ. And answerably hereto we read, that S. *Paul* 1. *Cor*. 15. after he had reckoned diuers, who had seene our Sauiour after his Resurrection, concludeth in the end with these words: *Nouissimè tamquam abortino visus est mihi*, which saying of his had beene false, except he had seene Christ himselfe, seeing that the rest numbred by S. *Paul*, had seene him in his owne true, and naturall Body.

Neither can it be said (as some others would haue it) that S. *Paul* saw Christ, as he was in Heauen, and not heere vpon the Earth, or in some neere place of the aire: and this for diuers reasons. First because those, that were with *Paul*, did heare a voyce, and saw a great light, *Act*. 9. & 22. but the Eares, and Eyes of his Companions, could not penetrate so farre as Heauen. Secondly, because the light, which appeared to S. *Paul* himselfe, was so great, as it almost stroke him dead for the time: which could not haue had in likelyhood such force, if it had come so farre, as from Heauen. Thirdly, if S. *Paul* had seene Christ only in Heauen, it might haue beene obiected to him, that he was no true witnesse of his Resurrection, and that what he had said to haue seene, was only in imagination, and a strong apprehension of the Mind.

Now our Aduersaries cannot heere obiect, that if our Sauiour did appeare heere vpon the Earth, or in the Ayre, truly, and really to S. *Paul*, that notwithstanding he was not circumscriptible in that place for the time, in that he is only circumscriptible, as he is in heauen. This vrgeth nothing: For, for a Body to be circumscriptible in a place, it is not required, that it should not be circumscriptible in no place also, but only it is required, that it should be truly commensured with that place; so as the *Termini* of the Place, and the Body be answerable the one to the other.

(c) *Vnity of Essence*.] The essentiall vnity of a thing dependes not of the vnity of Place, seeing a thing is one, before it hath one place: so as to be in place is but subsequent, and accessory to the nature of any body; but it dependes of the internall principles of the said thing.

(d) *Neere to the Earth*.] The same Body in seuerall places may be neere to the ground, and far of from the ground. Neither doth this imply any contradiction; for seeing, that when a Body is in

diuers places, and the relation is terminated to diuers places, it therefore necessarily followeth, that this diuerse relation is multiplied; for it is to be vnderstood, that those contrary relations are in one, and the same subiect *per diuersa fundamenta*, to wit, in a different respect of seuerall places; which diuersity of respect taketh away all contradiction in the thing it selfe.

(e) *Remaine wounded.*] For those things, which are receaued in the Body it selfe (be they eyther Actions or Qualities) are not multiplied: And the reason hereof is, because the Body is but one, and not many, or diuers: And being but one, it can but haue *vnum esse Substantiale*, though diuers *esse Localia*, as the School-men do speake, who therupon teach, that all those relations, and actions, which are terminated *ad Loca*, to the diuersity of places, are multiplied, because they follow, and depend vpon *esse Locale*: but such Actions, or Qualities, as are receaued within the body placed, are not multiplied, because they follow *esse Substantiale*.

(f) *Locall Motion.*] The Body of Christ is in a place, where before it was not; and this neither by any Locall Motion, or new Generation of it, but by a true Conuersion of the Bread into the Body; not much vnlike vnto the new being of the Soule in the Matter, or Substance, which is added to Mans Body by nutrition, where we see the Soule to be in that part, not by any Locall Motion, nor Generation of the Soule, but only by informing that part newly adioyned to the Body, which afore it did not informe.

(g) *Not continued.*] The Body of our Sauiour, as it is in the hands of the Priest, cannot be said to be continued with the same Body, as it is in Heauen, nor yet to be deuided from the same, seeing those things only, which are many and diuers (whether they be *Tota*, or *Partes*) are capable of continuation, or diuision: Now, Christs Body (as it is in Heauen) and in the Priests hands, is not two seuerall entire things, neither seuerall parts therof, but only one whole, and entire Body. And though there be a great distance of place, and interposition of many other Bodies betweene Christs Body in Heauen, and vpon the Altar; this only proueth, that those places, to wit, Heauen, and the Earth, are discontinued, and deuided one from the other; and that Christs Body is deuided from it selfe, in respect of such diuersitie of place, but not in respect of it proper substance.

(h) *Heauen.*] According to that in Actes, c. 3. *Oportet illum Cœlum suscipere, vsq; ad tempus restitutionis omnium*. And yet our Aduersaries do idly cauill in charging vs, that we force Christ to leaue Heauen by this doctrine of Transubstantiation. And when we reply, that we teach that Christ neuer leaueth Heauen, but is both in Heauen,

uen, and vpon the Altar: then they ignorantly obiect, that for a Body to be in Heauen, and vpon the Altar at one time, is a meere contradiction, and consequently impossible. But this is grosse Ignorance, for, for to be in Heauen, and not in Heauen, or vpon the earth, and not vpon the earth at one, and the same time, is a flat contradiction, and consequently cannot be performed by God. But to be in Heauen and vpon the earth at one time, is no more a Contradiction, then the soule to be at once, both in the Head, and the foote.

(i) *Neerneſſe to it ſelfe.*] Because (as it is said aboue) it is one, and the same Body, as it is in Heauen, and vpon the Altar: and consequently in substance, and quantity cannot be deuided, or separated from it selfe, notwithstanding any distance of place.

(k) *To transcend.*] If to be in a place, were of the essence of a Body (as we haue proued afore, that it was not) then the being of a body in diuers distant places, may seeme to increase the quantity of the said body. Furthermore the Body of Christ being vnder the formes of many consecrated hoasts, doth no more increase in quantity, then the soule being first in a child, and after dilating it selfe through the Body being growne greater, can be said to be greater, then afore it was.

(l) *One, and the same.*] Quantitie cannot be separated from a true naturall body, and therfore seeing Christs Body (as it is in Heauen, and vpon the Altar) is but one; so must it quantity be one, and the same.

(m) *An indiuiduall Substance.*] This indiuision of Substance is not so meant, that where one part of the Person is, there should be another (for this is most false) but the Person is so called, because it is one subsistng thing, not deuided in it selfe, in respect of it subsistence, yet deuided from all other things.

(n) *Accompany the Diuinity.*] For where the Humanity is, there is the Diuinity (as is aboue proued) yet followeth it not, that where the Diuinity is, there is the Humanity also.

(o) *Somewhere not Man.*] Though the Word may be somewhere, where the Humanity is not, notwithstanding there the Word is Man, because the Word existing there, doth support the Humanity, as proper to it selfe, though existing in another place.

(p) *Ouerthrowing many Mysteries.*] For it is impossible, that Christs Body being in all places, should be truely conceaued in the wombe of our Blessed Lady, or that it was borne, and dyed, or did arise againe, or ascended vp to Heauen; for if his Body be in all places, then it was in the Virgins wombe after his birth; so also it was in the graue both before his death, & after his resurrection, as also in Hea-

uen before his Ascensiō. Againe these Mysteries could not be truly performed except the Body of Christ did truly, & really moue from one place to another: But Christs Body being in euery place cānot be said to moue from place to place; for true Locall Motion of a Body cānot be conceaued, without obteyning of a new place, which afore it had not: so many points of Christian Religion, and of all true Philosophy *Luthers* Vbiquity impugneth.

(q) *Eutiches Heresy.*] The Heresy of *Eutiches* (besides other points) was, that the Flesh of Christ was not of the same nature with ours. And that the *VVord* was not changed into true flesh, but rather into an apparent only, and seeming flesh. So as the *VVord* rather counterfaited it selfe to be Man, to be borne, to haue died &c. then that there was any such true performance of these things. He further taught, that because the *Diuinity* was in the Sunne, the starres &c. that therefore this apparent Body of the *VVord* was there also. And hitherto doth *Luthers Vbiquitie* tend; for how can Christs Body be a true, and naturall Body, if it be in all places?

THE

THE THIRD PASSAGE.

CHAP. V.

NOVV to aſcend to the laſt Mount of difficulties in this miraculous Tranſelementation: We are to obſerue, that though the Body of Chriſt be heere indued with Life, yet it is not (a) obiectiuely ſenſible; though it be a true corporall Subſtance, it is not tangible; and though it be coloured, it is not viſible. In (b) like ſort we teach, that it heere performing the operations of Senſe, and enioying the organs of Senſe, doth yet performe them without the help of thoſe ſaid organs. We heere alſo find Quantity without (c) Diuiſion, Magnitude without (d) Place, a Body without (e) Circumſcription, Parts really (f) diſtinguiſhed, yet confounded; and being (g) remote one from another, yet touching one another. So as we heere find Contiguity in (h) diſtance, Confuſion (as I may ſay) in diſtinction, and a ioyning togeather in ſeparation. My meaning is, that

that Christs Body, though hauing Quantity, yet doth heere exist, as if it were without (i) Quantity, for the parts therof are receaued in the same place, and yet doe not penetrate themselues. In like sort his Body hath heere the true quantity, and distinction of parts, which it hath in Heauen, and yet it is (without being greater, or lesser) wholy contayned within the least part of a consecrated Hoast. Thus we see, that though a (k) Spirit (euen by Gods Omnipotency) cānot be extended in place, yet that a Body may want all such extension. And thus answerably heereto we teach, that this sacred Body is whole in euery part, and yet hath a true distinction of Parts. And so though the externall formes be broken, or disparted in themselues; yet the Body lying vnder them, remaines in the least parcell therof, entire, and vndeuided; as we see that when a looking-glasse is broken, a mans whole face will appeare in euery parcell thereof. Briefely we hould, that in this stupendious Mysterie, that Christs Body remaining a Body, & not a Spirit, yet doth exist as a (l) Spirit, and not as a Body: so as we may well terme it in a sober construction a Body (m) spiritualized.

These (loe) alledged, and at large in the marginall References solued, are the chiefest Mysteries, and difficulties, which are produced in the doctrine of the Real Presence. And heere I am to aduertise the Reader of two things; the one, that the most (if not all) of these obscurities were first through an incessant agitatiō of the mind discouered by our Catholike (n) School-men for the more exact search of the truth, and after most fully answered by them; so as these short currents of doubts, from thence receaued their stops, from whence they first did

did spring. But now our Aduersaries (for it is the misfortune of learning, euer to be wounded by her owne hand) are not ashamed euen to turne the edges of those Arguments (first propounded, and answered by Catholike Deuines, vpon vs, who maintayne the said faith which those Doctours did. By which course of proceeding, we may easily discouer, how barren, & dry our Sectaries are, for they bring little, or nothing of themselues to impugne our faith heerin, but only Eccho forth what they haue heard our learned Catholikes afore speak; yet do they Eccho after a strange manner, for they do not repeate the last words (as in nature, and reason they should) but this were for their disaduantage, since they containe the answers, and solutions; but only the firster part thereof, wherin do lye the obiections.

The other point, wherof the Reader is to take notice, is this: That most of the former difficulties (especially of the two latter Passages, or Chapters) do consist in the repugnancy, which they beare to the outward Sense, and therfore seeing, that these are chiefly insisted vpon, and more & more reinforced by our Aduersaries, we may heere truly say, that no small part of a Sacramentaries Faith lyes in his eye. Thus howsoeuer such rapt Spiritualists will at other times vaunt of their hidden reuelations from God, concerning the secrets of their Profession; yet you shall euer find them, euen in the midst of these their aerie, & high-towring Illuminations, to looke downe vpon Sense and naturall Reason (though Reason teacheth vs not to rely vpon Reason in things transcending Reason) bearing themselues herein, not much vnlike to your great vnprofitable Kites, which though they fly high, yet they haue their Eye still fixed vpon the earth.

(a) *Not obiectiuely sensible.*] That is, that the externall sense of another cannot apprehend it to haue life. Now, the Catholikes doe generally teach, that (in regard of the peculiar manner of the existence of Christs Body in the Eucharist) *Adiectiues*, which include a necessary reference *ad Corpora circumstantia*, do not predicate of his Body, as it is in the Eucharist, though they may be said of it, as it is in heauen. The reason hereof being, in that the Body of Christ is vnder the formes of bread, and wine, without any reference, respect, or order *ad Corpora circumstantia*. And therefore though his Body, as it is in the Sacrament be a naturall, and corporall substance, indued with life, sense, and colour; yet it is not there tangible, sensible, or visible &c. because to be actually tangible, sensible, or visible, implieth a reference *ad Corpora circumstantia*, in whose senses, and eyes the Body is so to appeare.

(b) *In like sort we teach.*] Christs Body in the Eucharist hath eyes, and eares, because it is there a true, and perfect body; which it could not be, except it were organized with those parts. And yet those organs of Sense do not exercise in the Eucharist (as they are in the Eucharist) these faculryes (as the Eye to see, the eare to heare.) The reason hereof is that, which was touched afore, to wit, that not only *Adiectiues* which haue relation *ad Corpora circumstantia*, but also *Verbes*, which imply a presence of his Body in the Eucharist with reference *ad Corpora circumstantia*, do not predicate of his Body, as it is in the Eucharist, in regard of his spirituall, and peculiar manner of existing there, though they do predicate of it, as it is in heauen. Now to see, to heare &c, beares a necessary reference *ad Corpora circumstantia*, to wit to the externall obiect of the Eye, and to the sound caused by some body &c. Notwithstanding Christ in the Eucharist may be said to see, to heare &c. and this for a double reason. First, because it is there the said body, which it is in heauen, but his body in Heauen seeth, heareth &c. therefore his Body in the Sacrament doth see, and heare, though not *quatenus est in Sacramento*. A second Reason may be, in that as his body is in the Sacrament, so it is accompanied with the Diuinity, in the fruition whereof the Humanity seeth, and heareth all things. And in these two respectes the ancient Fathers (according to that saying of S. *Basil: Verba Inuocationis &c. quis Sanctorum scripto nobis reliquit?* c. 27. lib. de Sp. sancto:) as also the Priest in those words, *Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis*, did, and doth daily pray vnto Christ, as he is in the Eucharist,

(c)

as being most confident, that he doth there heare him.

(c) *Without Diuision.*] The Body of Christ as it is considered in it selfe, hath a true quantity, and consequently it is diuisible, but yet in regard, that it existeth in the Eucharist after the manner of a spirit, and not of a naturall body, as being exempted from all extension of place (for it is whole in euery part) therefore it may in this sense be said, that it is not diuisible.

(d) *Magnitude without place.*] Most of the difficulties in this Chapter are solued, by knowing, what is of the essence of Magnitude, or Quantity, and what not, therefore I will insist the longer in setting downe the iudgements of the best learned herein. The Philosophers then doe assigne three things to concurre to Magnitude, of which the one euer causeth the other.

The First of these three is, that euery Magnitude should haue an extension in it selfe, and haue *Partem extra Partem*, that is, that one Part should not be confounded in it selfe with another Part, and consequently an intrinsecall site, and disposition of parts. And this is of the very essence of euery Magnitude, and cannot be separated from the same. Thus we say, that a *Body* is an extension in *Longitude*, *Latitude*, and *Profunditie*: *Superficies* an extension in *Longitude*, and *Latitude*; *A Line* an extension in *Longitude* only. So as extension euer presupposeth different parts of the body, and consequently a Body cannot want extension.

The second thing agreeing to euery Magnitude, is, to haue a commensuration, or coextension with place, that is, an extrinsecall disposition, and order of Parts according to Place: And this second ariseth from the first, and consequently as being later in nature, then the first, may by Gods Power, be separated from the same, yea it is actually separated from the first in the highest Sphere, which being a true Body, hath true Magnitude, and *Partem extra Partem*, and yet it hath not any Coextension, or Commensuration with place, for it is in no Place. In like sort, if God before the Creation of the world, had created a Man, or a stone &c. this Man or stone would haue had *Partem extra Partem*, and yet without any coextension or commensuration with Place.

The third, and last property of Magnitude, is, to extrude, and driue away all other Magnitudes from that place, which is made equall, and commensurable to it selfe, that is, not to suffer another Magnitude to be in the same place with it. Now, as the second was later, and proceded from the first, so this third resulteth out of the second, and is later then the same in nature: So answerably hereto we see, that the reason why one Magnitude doth not suffer another to

be in the same place, is, because it doth possesse all the place it selfe. But now seeing, that the later depends on the first, and not the first of the later, therfore we do hould, that *Diuinâ virtute* it may be effected, that a Body may possesse, and occupy a place, and yet not expell another from the same. And this is that, which we call *penetration of bodies*, so much impugned by our Protestant Philosophers. Now according to this doctrine (which is deliuered by all our best Philosophers) we hould, that Christs Body in the Sacrament hath the true, and whole Magnitude of his body. But this Magnitude hath there only the first condition, which is essentiall to euery Magnitude (to wit, to be extended in it selfe, and by reason of that intrinsecall extension, to haue *Partem extra Partem*) but it hath not the second condition (much lesse the third) for it is not coextended with any place, since though it haue true Quantity, yet it is not cõmensurable with any place, but existeth whole (in respect of all externall place) in euery part. And thus what is assigned in this Passage to our Sauiours Body in the Sacrament, which seemes to be common to euery naturall body, it is to be vnderstood (according to the first condition of Magnitude) of the extension of the body in it selfe, and intrinsecall disposition of it parts without any reference to Place. But what is heer denyed to the said body, as it existeth in the Sacrament, which is incident to euery other naturall body, that is meant of it (according to the second, or third condition) only in respect of externall extension of parts, and outward commensuration with place, which heere it wanteth. And this may suffice for this Point, where by the true application of it, most (if not all) of the doubts of this Passage may be answered; and therfore they will only need a short application hereof for their full Illustration.

(e) *Without Circumscription.*] viz. Externall Commensuration of Place.

(f) *Really distinguished.*] viz. Distinguished in respect of an intrinsecall disposition of parts in it selfe, though confounded in regard of Place, it being whole in this respect (as also in respect of the outward sensible formes) in euery Part.

(g) *Remote.*] They are separated, and remote one from another in regard of the inward distinctions of Parts, yet they touch one another, because they want all Circumscription of place.

(h) *Contiguitie in distance.*] viz. In the different respect of the inward site, or disposition of parts, and the outward coextension of place.

(i) *Without Quantity.*] Because it wanteth the second, and third condition of Magnitude aboue mentioned, which are incident

dent to euery Body, as it is naturally in place.

(k) *Though a Spirit.*] A Spirit cannot be extended in place, because it hath not any extension of Parts at all, & therfore it is indiuisible; for seeing, to be extended in place is a formall effect, proceeding from it formall cause of Extension in it selfe: if therfore a Spirit should be extended in place, we should admit the formall Effect without the formall Cause, which cannot be, since the formall Effect is later in nature, then the Cause, and cannot be without the Cause, though the formall Cause may be without the Effect, as we say heere; that the inward Extension of Christs Body doth want (by Gods power) all extension of place.

(l) *Exist as a Spirit.*] viz. As not hauing any Coextension with place, no more then a Spirit.

(m) *Spiritualized.*] Not that the Body by this meanes is become a Spirit, for that is false: Nor that still remaining a Body, is withall a Spirit, for that is impossible: Not that the Body of Christ is in the Eucharist only Spiritually, as the word *Spiritually* in our Aduersaries construction is opposed against the words *Truly, or Really*: But it may be said to be *Spiritualized*, because (as it is often said) it existeth in the Eucharist like a Spirit, to wit, without any extension of place, but being (in respect of all such extension) whole in euery part.

(n) *Catholike Schoole-men.*] For these, and such like are handled, and discussed by *S. Thomas Aquinas, The Master of the Sentences, Scotus, Suarez, Vasquez*, and diuers others.

THE

THE PROTESTANTS DIFFICVLTY OF

A Body being in diuers Places, answered from two more difficult Mysteries of the Trinity, *and the* Incarnation.

CHAP. VI.

NOVV after we haue dissected (as it were) point after point such difficulties in the Blessed Sacrament, wherein the very synewes, and strength of our Aduersaries cause doe chiefly lye; We are further heere to aduertise the Reader, that through the consideration of many Dogmaticall (a) Assertions in Christian Religion (whereof some are set downe in the Marginall References, besides others reserued to their peculiar Chapters)

piers) and of other irretragable Positions in Philosophy, we may fully perceaue, that Mans vnderstanding is too short a scantling to measure out Gods power. For diuers such Passages there are, & other Conclusions in Nature, whereunto all Christians giue an absolute assent, and yet their proofes cannot be deduced from the grounds of Naturall Reason: so true it is, that perfection in knowledge is not in this life the portion of Man. I will insist in some particulers, so shall our Aduersaries see, that they haue reason either to admit the Catholike doctrine of the Eucharist, or else with the deniall thereof to deny the said Articles of Christian Faith, and other Philosophicall Demonstrations.

First then may be presented to vs that Cardinall Mistery of the *Trinity*, which is indeed the *basis*, and foundation, whereupon the edifice, or structure of Christian Religion is builded. Heere now our Faith teacheth vs (for by the Eagle wings thereof only we do mount so high, our Sense, and naturall Reason fluttering ouer neere the ground) that there is one peculiar nature in three different Persons; so as to patterne this to that in the *Eucharist*, we find an Vnity, or (as I may tearme it) an Individuality of *Nature*, and a diuersity of *Persons*, sortable to the Vnity of a Body, & multiplicity of places. Now heere we are to know, that euery one of these three Persons is identified really, and formally with this nature (the strictest Vnion that can be conceaued) whereas the Body is only externally conioyned with the place; so much is the difficulty of a Body enioying at once diuers locall Circumscriptions, surpassed by this dogmaticall Point of one nature being in seuerall Persons without any distraction, or multiplication thereof.

Now secondly, if we looke into that other chiefe Point of the *Incarnation*, whereby the Deity of God appeared in the frailty of Mans nature (as the Sũne shines in a puddled water) we shalbe oppressed euen with store of difficulties presented to vs therin. I will not insist in euery particuler therof; therfore I will passe ouer, how in this astonishing doctrine of Christianity, Christ being borne in Time, was yet begot before all Time; and but newly borne, was full growne; lying weakly in a Cradle, yet able to dissolue with his finger the whole frame of this world; ignorant (in some sense) of the end of the world, yet knew all things; dyed in the raigne of *Tiberius*, yet slaine from the beginning of the world. Finally his Soule separated from his Body by death; yet could not dye, since death ouer him had no power.

These, and the (b) like (I say) I will pretermit, & will chiefly rest (as most pertinent to this place) in this one Point, to wit, how one *Hypostasis*, or *Person* is in two *Natures*; for whatsoeuer our Aduersaries can alledge for impugning of a Body to be in seuerall places, the same is heere found with all aggrauating circumstances. Will they obiect, that the Places are really diuers, and farre distant one frõ another? But heere the *Natures* are more different, and dislike, the one being *Diuine*, and the other *Humane*. Or will they say, that the vnion of the Body, and the place is so strait, as that it hindereth, why the said Body should be in another place? But heere the Vnion betweene the *Person*, and the *Nature* is far greater, since that former is meerly accidentary and extrinsecall, this intrinsecall and substantiall: And which is more, heere the Person, or *Hypostasis* is identified, and made the same really, and formally with it *diuine Nature*, and yet

is vnited most inwardly with the *Humane Nature*. If therfore one Person may be in two different, and vnlike Natures, being vnited most intrinsecally with either of them, and yet neyther this *Person* deuided, nor the *Natures* confounded: much more may a naturall Body be in diuers places (whose possessing of them is meere extrinsecall) without either diuision of the Body, or confusion of places.

Thus we see how our Aduersaries confessing the greater difficulty, cannot be induced to beleiue the lesser: *such blind* (c) *Guides they are, who straine out a Gnat, & swallow a Camell.* Now if they were pressed to salue all doubts in this Article by Naturall Reason, I am sure (how learned soeuer they are) they would confesse a great Impossibility therin; since God as Man, is scarce able to penetrate the Mysteries of Man as God. Then by the same Reason they are to reiect in any other dogmaticall Point whatsoeuer, these first Conceptions, and secret breathings of Atheisme: *How?* & *by what meanes?* Whereunto to answere only by the Light of Reason, and to deny whatsoeuer cannot be made good therby, is to shew himselfe more conuersant in the Naturall Philosophers Catechisme, then in his Creatours sacred Writings; so prudently therfore it was said of our Father (d) Δογμα μὴ πολυπραγμόνει.

And thus much of this Paire, or Twins of Christian Mysteries (for their resemblance is great) the one consisting in the vnity of *Nature*, with reference to diuersitie of *Persons*, the other in the Vnity of the *Person*, with respect to diuersitie of *Natures*.

(a) *Dogma-*

(2) *Dogmaticall Assertions.*] A third Example (besides those two chiefe Mysteries afore specified) may be the wonderfull difficulty of *Creation*, or *Annihilation*, which to Heathen Philosophers may seeme to imply a Contradiction: for to say, that *Something* may be made of *Nothing* (which is *Creation*) and that *Something* may be turned into *Nothing* (which is *Annihilation*) may be thought to say, that *Something* is *Nothing*, and *Nothing Something*. And doubtlesse it cannot be apprehended by Mans vnderstanding, that a *Thing* should now exist, which afore was Nothing; and in like sort, that *Something* should be turned into *Nothing*, except this *Nothing* be *Something*.

A fourth Example may be the *Resurrection* of the Dead. Now the difficulty in this Mysterie is, how one, and the same *Individuum*, or particuler Body should be twice made: for if it be twice, then is it with a double action: and if with a double action, how comes it to passe, that it is not two? seeing that the *Effect* depends on the *Action*, *vt eius Terminus*.

Furthermore this Mystery is made more incomprehensible, by reason of the *Anthropophagi*, or *Cannibals*, who feeding vpon Mans flesh; neuertheleſſe both their owne bodies, and the bodies of those others (vpon whom they feed, and whose flesh is turned into the flesh and substance of the *Canniballs*) shall rise at the day of the resurrection most distinct, and seuerall Bodyes: where we see, that one Body is turned into the substance of another, and yet hereafter that very said substance is to rise vp most different, and distinct Bodies.

A fifth Example may be taken from the *Paynes of the damned*, where the soules, and the Diuells are tormented, and punished with corporall fire: for if the burning of the fire doth not otherwise torment a thing then *dissoluendo continuum*, then how can it afflict an Indiuisible Substance, as the Soule of Man, or a Spirit is? of which Point see *Augustine lib. 21. de Ciuit. Dei. cap. 2. 3. 4. & 5.*

A sixt, is the Obseruation, how a *Spirit* can be detayned, and holden by a Body: for it seemeth no lesse difficult to be vnderstood, how a Spirit should be holden by a Body, that it passeth not whereſoeuer it would, then that a Body should not be detayned, and hindered by another Body, but that it may freely passe through any solide bodyes, as if they were no Bodies at all. Now the firster part of this difficulty appeareth in the former example of the Diuells, who (being incorporall Substances) are detayned with Hell fire, so as that they cannot passe whither they would; which point may be also exemplified

fied by our Soule, which being an immateriall Substance, is deteyned, and holden by our Body.

A seauenth, may be taken from the Examples out of the Scriptures, where we read, that the Fire by Gods Power did suspend it faculty of heating, *Dan.*; And that *Christ*, and S. *Peter* by the same Power did walke vpon the waters, *Matth.* 14. and the like. Now, if God can effect, that, that which is naturally hoate, shall not heate, and that which is naturally ponderous, and heauie, shall not descend downwards hauing no hinderance: by the same reason is he able to make, that a true body may want also circumscription of place. For the reason, why through diuine power, that which is hoat, shall not heate, nor a thing ponderous shall not descend towards the Center, is, in that *Causa est prior Effectu*, the cause is before it effect, and therefore not depeading on the effect, may by God be separated from the same: but the like reason is found in Magnitude, which is the Cause, and to fill, or possesse a place, which is the effect arising from the said cause, and therefor later in nature then it. Besides, *Grauitas*, or *Ponderosity* is not only the cause, why a heauy body doth descend being out of it naturall place, but it is also the cause thereof euen in that kind of Cause (to wit, *in genere causæ formalis*) in which, Magnitude is the cause, why a Body doth possesse a place.

An eight may be deduced from other Examples in Scripture, whereby is proued, that diuers bodies may possesse one, and the same place, and consequently, that a Body may want all circumscription of place. Hereof are no few Examples borrowed from our Sauiour himselfe, as that of his *Natiuitie*, where our Sauiour did proceed out of the wombe of the Blessed Virgin without any breach of the Virginall parts. For thus hereof doe the Fathers write, to wit *Hierome in Apolog. pro libris contra Iouinianum*, *Gregorie Nazianzen* in Tragœdia, *Christus Patiens*. *Augustinus epist.* 3. *ad Volusianum*, *Ambrose* lib. *de instit. Virginum* c. 7. A point so generally belieued by the ancient Fathers, that *Iouinian* is for the denyall thereof registred for an Heretike by *Ambrose epist.* 80. & 81. In like sort we read *Iohn* 20. that Christ came to his disciples *Ianuis clausis*, which action howsoeuer our Aduersaries seeme to elude, yet doe the Fathers generally acknowledge the Wonder herein to be, that the Body of our Lord did then penetrate another solide, and firme body: thus *Hierome epist. ad Pamachium*, *de erroribus Ioannis Constantinop.* *Epiphanius hæres.* 64. *Ambrose in cap. vlt. Lucæ*, as also *Chrysostome*, and *August.* vpon this place. Againe another is of our Sauiours rising out of the graue, the monument, or doore thereof being shut. In which point also the Fathers put the former like Miracle, to wit, that a true natu-

(2) *Dogmaticall Assertions.*] A third Example (besides those two chiefe Mysteries afore specified) may be the wonderfull difficulty of *Creation*, or *Annihilation*, which to Heathen Philosophers may seeme to imply a Contradiction; for to say, that *Something* may be made of *Nothing* (which is *Creation*) and that *Something* may be turned into *Nothing* (which is *Annihilation*) may be thought to say, that *Something* is *Nothing*, and *Nothing Something*. And doubtlesse it cannot be apprehended by Mans vnderstanding, that a *Thing* should now exist, which afore was Nothing; and in like sort, that *Something* should be turned into *Nothing*, except this *Nothing* be *Something*.

A fourth Example may be the *Resurrection* of the Dead. Now the difficulty in this Mysterie is, how one, and the same *Individuum*, or particuler Body should be twice made; for if it be twice, then is it with a double action; and if with a double action, how comes it to passe, that it is not two? seeing that the *Effect* depends on the *Action*, *vt eius Terminus*.

Furthermore this Mystery is made more incomprehensible, by reason of the *Anthropophagi*, or *Cannibals*, who feeding vpon Mans flesh, neuertheleſſe both their owne bodies, and the bodies of those others (vpon whom they feed, and whose flesh is turned into the flesh and substance of the *Canniballs*) shall rise at the day of the resurrection most distinct, and seuerall Bodyes: where we see, that one Body is turned into the substance of another, and yet hereafter that very said substance is to rise vp most different, and distinct Bodies.

A fifth Example may be taken from the *Paynes of the damned*, where the soules, and the Diuells are tormented, and punished with corporall fire: for if the burning of the fire doth not otherwise torment a thing then *dissoluendo continuum*, then how can it afflict an Indiuisible Substance, as the Soule of Man, or a Spirit is? of which Point see *Augustine lib.* 21. *de Ciuit. Dei. cap.* 2. 3. 4. & 5.

A sixt, is the Obseruation, how a *Spirit* can be detayned, and holden by a Body; for it seemeth no lesse difficult to be vnderstood, how a Spirit should be holden by a Body, that it passeth not whersoeuer it would, then that a Body should not be detayned, and hindered by another Body, but that it may freely passe through any solide bodyes, as if they were no Bodies at all. Now the firster part of this difficulty appeareth in the former example of the Diuells, who (being incorporall Substances) are detayned with Hell fire, so as that they cannot passe whither they would; which point may be also exemplified

fied by our Soule, which being an immateriall Substance, is deteyned, and holden by our Body.

A seauenth, may be taken from the Examples out of the Scriptures, where we read, that the Fire by Gods Power did suspend it faculty of heating, *Dan.* 3. And that *Christ*, and S. *Peter* by the same Power did walke vpon the waters, *Matth.* 14. and the like. Now, if God can effect, that, that which is naturally hoate, shall not heate, and that which is naturally ponderous, and heauie, shall not descend downwards hauing no hinderance: by the same reason is he able to make, that a true body may want also circumscription of place. For the reason, why through diuine power, that which is hoat, shall not heate, nor a thing ponderous shall not descend towards the Center, is, in that *Causa est prior Effectu*, the cause is before it effect, and therefore not depeading on the effect, may by God be separated from the same: but the like reason is found in Magnitude, which is the Cause, and to fill, or possesse a place, which is the effect arising from the said cause, and therefor later in nature then it. Besides, *Grauitas*, or *Ponderosity* is not only the cause, why a heauy body doth descend being out of it naturall place, but it is also the cause thereof euen in that kind of Cause (to wit, *in genere causæ formalis*) in which, Magnitude is the cause, why a Body doth possesse a place.

An eight may be deduced from other Examples in Scripture, whereby is proued, that diuers bodies may possesse one, and the same place, and consequently, that a Body may want all circumscription of place. Hereof are no few Examples borrowed from our Sauiour himselfe, as that of his *Natiuitie*, where our Sauiour did proceed out of the wombe of the Blessed Virgin without any breach of the Virginall parts. For thus hereof doe the Fathers write, to wit *Hierome in Apolog. pro libris contra Iouinianum*, *Gregorie Nazianzen* in Tragœdia, *Christus Patiens*. *Augustinus epist.* 3. *ad Volusianum*, *Ambrose* lib. de *instit. Virginum* c. 7. A point so generally belieued by the ancient Fathers, that *Iouinian* is for the denyall thereof registred for an Heretike by *Ambrose epist.* 80. & 81. In like sort we read *Iohn* 20. that Christ came to his disciples *ianuis clausis*, which action howsoeuer our Aduersaries seeme to elude, yet doe the Fathers generally acknowledge the Wonder herein to be, that the Body of our Lord did then penetrate another solide, and firme body: thus *Hierome epist. ad Pamachium*, *de erroribus Ioannis Constantinop.* *Epiphanius hæres.* 64. *Ambrose in cap. vlt. Lucæ*, as also *Chrysostome*, and *August.* vpon this place. Againe another is of our Sauiours rising out of the graue, the monument, or doore thereof being shut. In which point also the Fathers put the former like Miracle, to wit, that a true natu-

all body should passe through the grave, it still remayning shut. See hereof *Augustin. serm.* 131. *de Tempore. Hieronym. epist. ad Hebidiam quæst.* 4. *Chrysostome Homil.* 88. *Ioan. in Baptista. Iustinus quæst.* 117. besides diuers others.

(b) *And the like.*] To wit, how in the Mysterie of the *Incarnation*, God separateth from the *Humanity* of Christ his manner of *subsistence*, inserting it in his *Diuinity*: A point, which hardly can be vnderstood without presuming some change in God, of which he is in no sort capable. Now, it is no more incident to an Accident to inhere in a Subiect, then it is naturall to a Substance to subsist by it selfe: if therfore God can effect, that a Substance shall not subsist by it selfe, as heere it doth not, why should not he be able to preserue an Accident without it Subiect?

(c) *Blind Guydes.*] *Matth.* 23.

(d) τὸ ΟΠΩΣ.] *Nazianzen. Orat.* 1. *de Theologia*, signifying as much, as, *Ne anxiè scrutemur modum rei.*

THE

THE SAME ANSVVERED BY *the like difficultie, drawne from* Eternity.

CHAP. VII.

A SECOND Example shalbe drawne from that, which in it Concrete, is the peculiar, & incommunicable Attribute of God, I meane *Eternity*: for if we find Mysteries far passing Mans vnderstanding in the Proprieties of God, how much short are we from sounding the bottomlesse gulfe of his Power, who is the fourse of the said Proprieties? But heere we are first to know, what *Eternity* is. The Philosophers (a) define it to be, *Instans Durationis non fluens*; An Instant of Duration, or continuance, which is euer present, and neuer passeth away. Thus *Eternity*, besides, that it hath no beginning (according to Philosophy) consisteth of that, which is shor-

ter, then the shortest time, and therin Indiuisible; and yet the continuance thereof, extendeth it beyond the length of all Tyme, and therin Interminable.

Now, the mayne difficulty heerin is this (and such which in the like touch of the doubt is greater, then the former confessed difficulty of multiplicity of place) to wit, That this Instant of Duration, being but one instant, yet is, and coexisteth in seuerall Tymes, both *past*, and *to come*; & yet neyther is this Instant deuided, or distracted in it selfe, nor these seuerall times confounded. He that seriously penetrateth this difficulty, how can he make doubt, but that by Diuine Power, one Body may be in seuerall places, without either diuision of the Body, or confusion of the places? And this the rather (a circumstance much increasing the Mystery heere alledged) in that, diuers places, wherein we suppose a Body may be, do still remaine at one time, though far distant one from another; whereas these precedent, and future times (in both which one, and the same Instant of Duration or *Eternity* is) are euer in a flowing, and departing Motion: and consequently cannot by any possibility whatsoeuer remayne, and exist togeather; for we see, that the *Tyme past* euer giues place to the *Tyme to come*.

And thus much of this abstruse difficulty of *Eternity* (the doctrine wherof who denieth, denieth withall Gods euerlasting Being) of which I was the more willing to intreat, because it is that, whereto after our Pilgrimage ended in this world, we all trust most ioyfully to arriue. And therefore (by allusion) we may truly say, that as *Eternity* in it owne natuie consisteth of a continued Instant; so of this short Instant of Mans Life dependeth all Eternity of future Ioy, or Calamity. Furthermore,

not

not only we, but all Creatures whatsoeuer, shall finally haue their Periode, and Dissolution in *Eternity*; yea Tyme it selfe, wherein all things are now swallowed vp, shall hereafter be absorpt in the abyssmall depth thereof. Thus what gaue an end to euery thing, shall in an endlesse *Eternity* receaue it end.

(a) *The Philosophers define.*] *Aristot. in Metaphysic. passim.*

A THIRD ANSVVERE

drawne from the Vbiquity *of God.*

CHAP. VIII.

PHILOSOPHY teacheth vs, that the higheſt Heauen is in Quantity finite, becauſe the reuolution of that huge Body is periodicall, and terminable, as being perfected within a prefixed time. The conſequence wherof is euicted, (by force of a contrariety) from a receaued Axiome among the learned; to wit, *What Body accompliſheth not it courſe in a deſigned, and limitable time, the ſame* (if any ſuch were) *is of an infinite, and immenſurable Quantity*. Now, vpon this *Baſis*, or ground (by reſemblance) we may ſtay our ſelues in the ſearch of his Power, who is the Creatour of all the Heauens: for ſince his Omnipotency is not confined within the compaſſe of any tyme (for himſelfe was before (a) all tyme:) nor of things (for he gaue the firſt (b) being to all things:)

nor

nor of Place (for he is both by (c) *Presence*, and *Might*, in all places:) It therfore may be assumed as an inexpugnable verity, that his said Power is infinite, boundlesse, and illimitable, and consequently that our weake vnderstanding is not able to lay any true lenell therto.

But since I haue heere named Gods *Vbiquity*, I will insist a little in one incomprehensible Mysterie found therin, it being such, as that it incomparably surpasseth that of one Body being in seuerall places. For how can our vnderstanding comprehend, that God (being one (d) simple, and indiuisible thing) should be at once in all places, and things whatsoeuer? A doubt so inexplicable, that it forced *S. Augustin* to say therof: *Miratur hoc mens humana, & quia non capit, forte asse non credit.* They cannot salue this Point in answering, that God doth repleniſh all places, as one place. For though we acknowledge, that all places are to him, as one; yet who will not graunt, but that he is able to create another world, farre remote from this? and so should be present in the same world, and consequently in seuerall, and farre distant places. Nor can they further reply, that it is lesse possible for a true naturall Body to be in seuerall places at once, then for God who is only a spirituall substance. This aduantageth them nothing, since the mayne reason, why it should seeme, that a Body cannot be in diuers places, is not taken so much *à mole corporis, quàm ab vnitate*, not from the heauy weight of the Body, but from the vnity therof; which vnity, as it is no lesse (but much more (e) perfect) in God, then in a Body; so it should seeme to be no lesse deuided, or distracted in it selfe in God, then in a Body, through his being in diuersitie of places. Thus we see, how this difficulty of being in di-

uer-

uers places, so often vrged, and reinforced by our Aduersaries is auoyded euen by the iudgement of all, except of those (if any such be) who will not confesse, that they can find him, who is in euery place; nor see him, who is in euery thing they see.

And thus much of these few Instances; the nature, and deliberate consideration whereof may seeme iustly to extenuate the obiected difficulties in the blessed Sacrament. And howsoeuer the learned Deuines haue laboured much in the explicating of these points; yet it is obserued, that hitherto they could neuer be brought to allow any one Mans Illustration of them: A Document to teach vs, that the wit of Man is too weake an Interpreter of Gods Power; and withall to admonish vs (for the more humbling of those high witts and conceipts, who haue eyes to see difficulties, but not iudgements to vnfold them) that in things once made questionable, in regard of the probable impugning of either part, and the vncertainty of what side the truth is (it not being matter of Faith) much Learning, is but much artificiall, and paynfull Ignorance.

To these former might be adioyned many other Philosophicall (f) Speculations, which cannot be confined, and (as I may say) circumscribed within the compasse of Mans wit; as that the least Quantity should be diuisible into infinite parts; That the highest Heauens being a true Body, should be carried with such a rapidity, and swiftnes of motion, as we see it is; That a (g) *Vapour* (how familiar, and obuious soeuer this obseruation seemeth) being only but water rarified, should possesse a greater place, then when it was elementall water; and seeing that before it was attenuated, there were as many

puncta,

puncta, or partes of it, as when it is become a Vapour, euery *Punctum*, or part therof hauing afore it due circumscription. Now then, it doth seeme as much repugnant to a determinate, and limitable substance, to exact a greater circumscription of Space, then afore it had, still remaining without any addition (*eadem substantia numero*) as for a substance to require a lesser, or none at all as we affirme of the Body of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament.

And finally (to omit many others) that the (h) *Loadstone*, or a piece of Iron, after it is but touched therwith, should euer haue their ends turned one way; The experience whereof, in that it falleth vnder euery vulgar eye, & the reason most inexplicable, I will therefore the more laboriously insist (in the reference hereto appropriated) in refuting all the most probable coniectures giuen thereof by the Learned: which is not vndertaken impertinently out of any vendiration, or vaunt of reading, for this were idle, and a foule blot of a Schollers Pen; but only to this end, to manifest, that all the Learning, and wit of Man is not able to set downe any sufficient, and satisfiable cause thereof, and that consequently it is perhaps to be referred only to the immediate will, and pleasure of God; who as in this (though experimentally subiect to ech Mans sense) so much more in the Mystery of the Eucharist (being a sublyme and supernaturall point of fayth) is able to accomplish that, which Mans capacity, and iudgement is not able to conceaue, or find the reason thereof. And therefore I admonish my Reader, that as heere the Needle, before it be touched, is ready to turne it selfe indifferently towards any quarter, or part of the world, but after, still

tends to one only coast; euen so it should fall out in our Iudgment, which though naturally without respect it may propend to any opinion in matters in Religion, yet after it hath enioyed that Magneticall, and Attractiue touch of the Churches Authority, it ought then to direct it course only to that Faith (how intricate and perplexed soeuer it seemes) whereunto God by his said Church perswadeth.

(a) *Before all Time.*] Seeing that Tyme (according to it definition in Philosophy) is but the course, or Motion of the highest Heauen *secundum prius, & posterius*, according to the firster, or later part of the said motion; and that seeing all the Heauens were once created of God: therfore it must needs follow, that God was before all times.

(b) *The first Being to all things.*] viz. through the creation of them, according to that of the Scripture, *in Deo sumus, & mouemur: Act. 17.*

(c) *By presence in all places.*] According to that *Hierem. 23. Cælum & terram ego impleo.* And that God is actually, and truly present in all places, is proued: First, because (as it is aboue said) it should otherwise follow, that he should be circumscribed, or defined in some certaine place, and consequently he should not be infinite. Secondly, God is vnited with euery thing he created, since the consistence, and the preseruation of each thing depends on God: but this vnion betweeh God, and his creatures, is not by the meanes of any Quality in God (for in God there is no Quality) therfore the vnion is with the Essence of God.

(d) *One simple, and indiuisible thing.*] The like Example may be taken from the Soule of man, which being indiuisible in it selfe, and most simple, is in euery part of the body, and whole in euery part: since otherwise, if it should be extended to the extension of the Body, it should be materiall, and depend only of the Body, and consequently it should not be immortall. Neither auaileth it to answere heerto, that the Soule possesseth the whole Body, as one Place; And that a signe hereof is, in that, if any one member be separated by any change from the Body, the soule ceaseth to be in that member, in that, that said part beginneth to be a different Body, existing by it selfe, and not depending

pedding on the former. This satisfieth nothing, for although the soule cannot naturally be preserued in a member cut from the rest of the body; yet there can be no reason assigned, but that God is able to preserue the soule in a part of the Body cut from the rest.

(e) *Much more perfect.*] The Vnity of God is much more perfect, then the Vnity of any thing whatsoeuer: for seeing that the Philosophers do define *Vnum*, to be that, which is *Indiuisum à se, sed diuisum à quouis alio*, & that this definition is more agreeable to God, then to any creature; therfore it followeth, that his Vnity is more perfect then the Vnity of any other thing. And hence it is, that among the other Attributes of God giuen him by the Philosophers (as *Primus, Infinitus, Optimus, Omnipotens* &c.) he is stiled by them also to be *Vnus*. Now, as he is *Vnus*, in respect of all Incomposition; so is he *Vnus* in regard, that he is but One, and not Many. Which point appeareth demonstratiuely from hence; for seeing that God is infinite (for otherwise he can haue no true Diuinity) we cannot conceaue, how there can be many Gods, and consequently many *Infinities*, without preiudice, or impeachment of one Infinitie in respect of another.

(f) *Philosophicall Speculations.*] Besides such difficulties in Philosophy (as are heerafter set downe in their particuler References) which may seeme to transcend Mans capacity, there are many other. As for example, The least mote in the Sunne, or other smallest thing that the Eye can hardly discerne, to haue in it selfe, truly, and really infinite parts; which thing the nature of *quantitas continua* containeth; which is defined to be *semper diuisibilis in diuisibilia*: which if otherwise it should be, then might a Body euen by naturall reason in the end become to be nothing, or annihilated, which can only be effected by Gods power.

In like sort, Mans vnderstanding cannot conceaue, how a true, solide, and firme body should be carried with that rapidity, or swiftnesse, as the Heauens are carried in their courses: for the highest Heauen (going his whole course in 24. houres) by the iudgment of Mathematicians & Philosophers, is really moued at least twenty thousand miles in the twinkling of an Eye: which thing what vnderstanding can conceaue? when the swiftest thing, that is in this world (whether it be the flying of a Swallow, or a bullet shot out of a Gun) if it should continue it motion for the space of an whole houre, would not go at the most, past fifty, or threescore miles, within the same time.

(g) *That a Vapour.*] A *Vapour* is essentially water, for we see it being resolued, turneth againe into the same water, *eandem numero*, which afore it was. It is therfore altered only accidentally, to wit, in these three qualities, in *Heate*, in *Tenuity* or thinnesse, and in *Leuity*,

vary; so that a Vapour is the same water, which afore it was, but more hoat, more thinne or attenuated, and more light.

(h) *The Loadstone, or a peice of Iron, after it is but touched therewith.*] I will not heere insist so much in the difficulty, how a Loadstone doth draw Iron to it, to wit, whether it be through a Sympathy of Nature betweene these two bodies, or through the proper forme of the Loadstone: or if through the proper forme thereof (which is the more generall Opinion) whether immediately of it selfe, or by the intervention of some Instrument: or if by the mediation of some Instrument (which is also the more increased conjecture) whether this Instrument is a sending forth of certaine corporeall *Atomi*, or spirits of the Loadstone, or only a transfusion of an incorporeall quality, or vertue thereof; and finally if it be a transfusion of an immateriall vertue (which is in like sort more commonly said to be) whether this vertue commeth out of the Loadstone, and so is really carried to the Iron, or only propagated by the *medium* thereto, so as the vertue still remayning in the stone, doth only beget, or multiply the like vertue through the ayre, till it come to the Iron, no otherwise, then when the heate of the fire by being multiplied in the aire, doth affect with heat, bodyes in good distance from the fire; which later sentence is also more approoued. In refelling of these, I will not insist, for seeing they are meerely speculatiue, and by the vrging of seuerall reasons in defence of euery opinion, (as being most remote from sense) may all be made coniecturally probable; Therefore I will chiefly rest in the other point, that is, in maintayning, that no true, nor certaine reason can be giuen, why the Loadstone it selfe hanging in the aire by a thred, or being put in a vessell of water, doth at all tymes tend with one, and the same point thereof in the same place, towards one, and the same point of the North, (for it being placed after either of these two wayes, is free from all letts of it naturall motion) or that a needle touched therewith, will in like sort direct the one end, still towards the North. Many reasons hereof I find alledged, but all are insufficient, and conuinced as false, euen by the Eye, and experience it selfe.

The first Reason, is giuen by those, which doe assigne the cause hereof to be some Northern part of the Heauen, to which the Loadstone, or Needle euer tendeth, though in setting downe, which this part should be, they dissent. Some doe maintaine, that the Northern Pole of the world, is the Point whereunto the stone is directed, as *Petrus Peregrinus in tract. de Magnete*. But this sentence is thus ouerthrowne. First, because then there should be no variation of the Needle, but that in all places it should directly tend towards the North Pole, which is found by experience, that it doth not. Now, heere by

the variation of the Needle is vnderstood, when the Needle tendeth either Eastwardly, or Westwardly from the Pole, which in seuerall Countries is found more, or lesse to do. Secondly, if the Pole it selfe were the Point, then the Northern end of the Needle should eleuate it selfe towards the Pole with vs heere in *England* (much more in other more *Boreall* Clymates) because to all such places the Pole is eleuated many degrees: but we see iust contrary hereto, that euen in all these Coūtries, the Northern part of the Needle doth depresse it selfe downwards to the earth, bending to some poynt many degrees vnder the *Horizon*, and consequently bearing it selfe more low, then the Southerne part thereof. And this depression of that part is commonly called the Declination of the Pole of the Loadstone, or Needle.

Others doe teach, the Pole starre to be the point, as *Franciscus Lopez lib. 1. hist. Occidental. Ind. c. 8.* and *Cardinus de subtilitate l. 7.* This also is false. First by the former reason of the afore alledged declination of the Needle, seeing that euen with vs, the Pole starre is euer many degrees aboue our *Horizon*. Secondly, because the Pole starre is euer in motion, and reuolution about the Pole of the world, and maketh it diurnall circle ech way distant more then two degrees from the Pole: therefore if this Starre were the cause hereof, then should the Needle follow the motion of that starre, and so euery houre of the day be in changing it course in any one place: which we find that it doth not at all. Thirdly, because we find, that the Needle in some Countries doth vary it motion aboue thirty degrees from the Pole of the world, whereas the furthest distance of the Pole starre from the Pole it selfe (as is said aboue) is not three degrees. Fourthly, because it would follow, that in those Southerne parts, where the Pole starre doth not rise, the Loadstone should not turne towards the North, by reason that this influence, and vertue of the Pole starre could not penetrate through the earth, and yet in those Australl Countries, the Needle retaineth it former quality: for euen in *Freto Magellanico* it is obserued to tend directly towards the Pole of the world.

There are also some, who assigne the cause hereof to other starres, and constellations neere vnto the Pole, and not to the Pole starre, as *Petrus Gregorius art. mirab. l. 10. c. 7.* and *Collegium Conimbricense ad 7. Physic. 2.* but this their error is refuted by all these former Arguments, which proue that the Pole starre is no cause thereof.

Finally, some others will haue some point aboue, but *extra Cælum*, to be the reason hereof; for they say, it cannot be referred to any point of Heauen it selfe, seeing that euery part therof (the Pole excepted) is mouable, and yet the needle in any one place, or Countrey neuer changeth it certaine site, and resting. Of this opinion is *Cortes*

part. 1. art. 2. cap. 5. But this is refelled (besides by some of the former alledged Arguments) euen from Philosophy it selfe; for seeing there is no Body or Subiect *extra Cœlum*, there can no vertue, or influence proceed from thence, since otherwise there should be *Actio originally sine Subiecto*, which cannot be. Againe that supposed point should be either moueable, or not moueable: if moueable, then should not the Needle in the same place alwaies looke, & tend one way: if immoueable, then should the Needle in all places respect one and the same point, but both these are false. And thus much of the first generall opinion which ascribeth the difficulty hereof to some part of the Heauens, or point beyond the Heauens.

The Second maine opinion, is of those, who allot the vertue of the Loadstone to a Mountaine of Loadstone, or a great Myne therof vnder the North Pole. Of this opinion are *Olaus lib. 12. c. 1. Procestor. de Sympath. & Antipath. Seuer. lib. 1. in schol. definitionis 13.* to which place (say these men) that by reason of the attractiue force of this great Mountaine, the Loadstone, or a needle touched therwith, tends vnto.

This opinio is also refelled: First because it would follow from hence, that a Loadstone, or Needle swimming freely, and without hinderance in the water, should be mouing with change of place euermore forward towards the North, and should not lye still vpon the water, only bearing one end towardes the North: but this it doth not.

Secondly, in that it is found by experience, that in a Port of the Hand *Elba* in *Italy*, not distant more then a mile from a great Rocke of Loadstone, the Needle touched with a Loadstone doth not turne towards that Rocke, but towards the North: if then that great Rock in *Elba* hath not the vertue to draw the needle to it, being so neere, how can it be thought probable, that the other Rock vnder the Pole can send it vertue so far to Needles touched with the Loadstone in Countreys remote, and distant from it?

Thirdly, because as *Scaliger* well noteth, *Exercit.* 132. the attractiue force, and vertue of that mountaine of Loadstone vnder the Pole, should be intercepted, and broken by reason of the swelling, & roundnesse of the earth, afore it could could come to other places farre distant from this mountaine: and it is most improbable to say, that this vertue doth penetrate through the earth to Countreys far distant: Or if it did, then it would follow, that in Countreys, more or lesse Southren, the Northren end of the needle should more, or lesse tend downwards into the earth, and vnder the *Horizon*: but no such change of declination is obserued to be.

Fourthly

Fourthly, because that wherſoeuer any one do put the Pole of the Loadſtone in reſpect of that Rocke, yet it would follow, that a Needle being placed in the ſame Parelell of this Pole yet diſtant farre from it, ſhould tend directly to the Eaſt, and in other places of the ſame Parelell to the Weſt, but not at all to the North. But experience to the contrary hereto is made, ſince in thoſe places it euer tendeth towards the North. And thus much of this ſecond opinion.

The third, and laſt is of thoſe, who attribute this vertue of the Loadſtone only to the *Specifica & interna forma* therof, whereby it ſelfe ſhould euer bend one way, or a needle touched therwith: Euen as the earth out of it ſpecificall nature, & forme tendeth towards the Center. This Reaſon is alſo gued, not becauſe it can be demonſtrated (for it is meerly in ſpeculation) but only as for their laſt refuge, in that all other ſuppoſed cauſes therof are found defective; which though it be ouer generall, and little better, then *Petitio principij*, and not much more, then to ſay, The Loadſtone tendeth towards the North, becauſe it tendeth towards the North: yet it is otherwiſe euidently confuted.

And firſt, ſeeing there is but one internall, & ſpecificall forme of all Loadſtones, and ſeeing it is obſerued, that, that very part of the Loadſtone doth beare euer towards the North, which was found to bee towards the North in the Mine, as ground, and that all Loadſtones do not beare after one, and the ſame manner in the Mine, the veines, or graine of ſeuerall Loadſtones lying in the Myne ſeuerall wayes; therefore followeth, that this peculiar direction towards the North, cannot be aſſigned to the internall *forme* of the Loadſtone.

Secondly, the forme of the Loadſtone (as the formes of all other compounded bodyes) doth proceed from the mixture of the Elements, but we find this vertue, or properſition of mouing not to be in any of the Elements; How then can they impart it to the Loadſtone?

Thirdly, if the forme ſhould be the cauſe of it direction, then ſhould it (in all probability) be performed by the mediation of ſome vertue or quality of the forme. Now, all qualities cauſed by the mixture of Elements, originally proceed *a primis qualitatibus*, and conſequently they are ſenſible: but this qualitie (if there be any ſuch) is inſenſible.

Fourthly, the Loadſtone being *Corpus graue*, hath a propenſion euen from it *forme* to deſcend downward (as we ſee it doth) therfore it cannot receaue from the ſame *forme* any other kind of motion, for ſo one, and the ſame *forme* ſhould affoard two different motions; which is abſurd to affirme.

Fiftly, if the proper *forme* ſhould thus moue it ſelfe, then ſhould the ſtone be a liuing creature, for it is only peculiar to a liuing creature locally

locally to moue it selfe.

Sixtly, and lastly; If there were no variation of the Loadstone turning it selfe towards the North, the cause of this motion might with more probability be assigned to the forme of the stone; but the variation thereof (according to the diuersity of Countries) is most diuers: for in some places it hath no variation at all; but directly tendeth to the Pole of the world: in other partes, to wit, in all the Occidentall Maritime places of *Europe*, and *Africke*, from *Norway* to the Cape of *Buona Speranza*, it bendeth more, or lesse towards the East from the North Pole; and in all the Orientall Maritime places of the North Parts of *America* from *Terra Florida*, to *Virginia*, *nuona Francia &c.* the Needle turneth it end towards the West from the Pole. Now then, seeing this irregularity, and diuersity of variation is such, and so great, in so much, that in some Countries the needle turneth from the Pole thirty degrees, and in other Countries more, or lesse Eastward, or Westward: how can it proceed from the internall, and specificall *forme* of the Loadstone, since the forme of euery body affoardes a certainty, and immutability of that motion, which it giueth thereto?

And heere now I will end: All which I haue produced only to this purpose, to shew, that the cause of the motion of the Loadstone (though the effect thereof be subiect to each mans eye) cannot possibly be apprehended by Man: & that it is Gods pleasure, either to be the immediate cause thereof himselfe; or at least resolued to conceale the same from vs. Now, if Mans vnderstanding be not able to penetrate into the causes of things sensible, materiall, and of what we haue dayly triall; can it be able in the mysterie of the Eucharist (being a point supernaturall, and altogeather remoued from sense) to sound all the difficulties thereof? Or shall it presume to confine Gods power within those limitts, and bounds, which shall be assigned as answerable to the weake proportion, and measure of it selfe, concluding thus: Mans vnderstanding cannot conceaue how all those seeming impossibilityes in the Eucharist can be salued: Therefore God cannot effect them. An Illation fitting to proceed from an Atheist, or an Heathen Philosopher, not from a Christian.

THE

THE DIFFICVLTIES OF A *Body wanting Circumscription of Place*, AND *of an Accident without a Subiect, are explained by the difficulties discouered in the Power of* Seeing, *and in the Circumstances thereof.*

CHAP. IX.

AMONG other Elementary grounds and Principles of the Mathematikes, this is one; (a) *Maximus Circulus, maximam Circulum secans, secant se inuicem in duas æquales partes; secus autem de Minoribus*: A great Circle cutting a great Circle, they euer deuide the one the other into two equal parts. The like may we say (by allusion) of the two

vaſt Circumferences of Gods *Power*, and *Wiſdome*, both which meeting togeather in the Center of euery thing created, and in the Creation therof mutually interſecting themſelues, they appeare of one, and the ſame Proportion, I meane, both diſcouering themſelues to be infinite, and ſurpaſſing all humane capacity. Now theſe being indeed of the very eſſence of God (for that Axiome is true, *Quicquid* (b) *in Deo eſt, Deus eſt*) do with moſt admiration manifeſt themſelues, among all his Creatures, chiefly in thoſe which enioy life. Among thoſe which enioy life, chiefly in Man; among all the corporeall parts of Man, chiefly in that ſmall great organ of the Eye. For who will not be aſtoniſhed, and burſt out with the Pſalmiſt, (c) *Quam magnificata ſunt opera tua Domine*, in cõtemplating the fabricke therof! Firſt to behould the prominency, and bearing out of the Forehead and Noſe, which ſerues as certaine fortreſſes to beare backe all ſuddaine attempts endangering the ſame: Then the hayres of the Eyelids ſtanding in moſt preciſe mãner, & order, as pales, or pikes to repell, and keep of the entrance of any noyſome thing: Next to obſerue the Lyddes themſelues, which (as Portculliſſes lifted vp and downe by the help of the ſynewy chaines) do let in all pleaſing obiects to the Eye, and forbiddeth entrance to all things domageable. After theſe are preſẽted to vs the many (d) *Tunicles*, and Skins, which ſerue (as certaine walls, or Countermures) to incompaſſe, ſtrengthen, and fortify this litle (yet rich) Citty of the Eye. And laſtly (beſides the (e) veines giuing nourilhment, the (f) Arteries life, and the (g) Synewes, motion to the ſame) as alſo, beſides the two *Opticke* (h) *Synewes*, which ſerue (as the Porters betweene the *common Senſe*, and the *Eye*) to conſider the

diuers

diuers (i) *Humors*, which are to the *Eye*, as so many Riuers, by means wherof sufficient prouision (k) is brought in for the maintayning of the seuerall Partes thereof; as also all (l) ordures (whose stay, and putrefaction would much offend it) are conuayed away.

And thus much of the compacture, and frame of the *Eye*; where (if we remember) that all those parcells (most different one from another in substance, forme, vse, and operation) are made by Gods power of one, & the same part of a little slimy matter; and by his Wisdome, and Prouidence are become thus subordinate one part to another, and all seruiceable to the faculty of *Seeing*; how can we rest doubtfull, that the same *Power*, and *Wisdome* are not able to effect the greatest difficultyes appearing in the Mysterie of the *Eucharist*? But to proceed further herein; all this curious structure of the Eye is framed, that this Instrument may performe the operation of Seeing, and so we find it doth. But if we should enter into the manner, how it absolueth this it faculty, we enter into a Labyrinth of intricate speculatiõs, in regard of the different (m) opinions deliuered hereof. Thus, that we see, it is cleare: but how we see (if we beliene diuers) no Man yet cleerly seeth.

And now to come to that point which may seeme in some sort to patterne one of the greatest obscurities in the Eucharist: we find heere (following the most approued iudgment of the best (n) Learned) that the *Eye* being small in Quantity, is able to containe in it the true proportion of things most great, since the formes therof multiplyed in the ayre, and still retayning the figure of the true Quantity, are at the last receaued in at the *Eye*, there appearing in those perfect dimensions of breadth,

and length, which their subiects doe truely enioy. And which is more: we see by experience, that the *Eye* is able to discerne the true proportion of a great body in a small glasse, or in a point of a Diamond, where it is more wonderfull, because the forme of the said Body entreth into the glasse or diamond in a Pyramidall, or Spyre-like point, and yet being multiplied from the glasse, to the *Eye*, recouereth againe (as I may say) it former Quantity, and so is presented from the glasse to the *Eye*, as it was first from the subiect to the glasse: An obseruation most strange, were it not, that the daily, and familiar sight of any thing is euer the greatest Enemy to Admiration.

Now, out of all this I thus inferre; That if naturally the formes of things so great, can truly appeare in their owne bignes, in the small compasse of a glasse, or the Eye; cannot a Body really be in a lesser place, then naturally is answerable to the externall coextension of all it parts? And where it may be heere replied, that the formes, which are receaued into the Eye are only immateriall; we graunt this to be true, and therfore we vrge this Example not to paralell it exactly in all circumstances with the other, but to proue thus farre (since there seemes to be in some sort the like touch of the doubt) that if the one be daily performed by the ordinary course of Nature, why may not the other be also accomplished by the Omnipotency of that one (*yet Vniuersall*) *Nature*, who gaue the first being to this *secondarie Nature*.

A Second Point, wherein I will heere insist, is, that these *Species visibiles*, or formes of Subiects, being multiplied in the Ayre, as they come to the *Eye*, if the

Ayre

Ayre be changed, either by any wynd, or ſuddaine alteration, yet (as the chiefeſt (o) Philoſophers of this time, both Catholikes, and Proteſtants doe hould) the ſaid formes (euen *eadem numero*) are not extinct, but that they inhere in the next ſucceeding Aire, and ſo doe remoue from one Subiect to another Subiect. Now this conſideration moueth vs thus to conclude; That if the ſame *Accidences* doe naturally remoue from *Subiect* to *Subiect*, without any deſtruction of them, cannot God ſupernaturally preſerue an *Accident* without a *Subiect*? as we Catholikes doe believe, that he doth ſo preſerue the formes of Bread and Wine in the moſt holy Myſterie of the *Euchariſt*. And thus farre concerning theſe difficulties.

But now, ſeeing we haue begun to intreate of the Eye, I will end this Chapter with certayne pertinent animaduerſions drawne from this Inſtrument, and applyed to our vnderſtanding, the Eye of our ſoule.

Firſt then we know, that Nature hath giuen to Man two eyes, either of which, though they ſee a thing, as one thing, ſeuerally by themſelues, yet both of them looking vpon the ſame thing, do behold it, but (p) as one, not as two: whereby we may learne, that the Naturall light of our vnderſtanding ought to conſpire, and ioyne with the ſupernaturall light of faith in apprehending one, and the ſame thing: And ſo in the Myſterie of the *Euchariſt*, our Vnderſtanding, and Reaſon ought not in ſeeing the difficulties thereof to vary from our Faith; but to ſubordinate, and ſubiect it ſelfe to that heauenly, and infuſed Power.

Againe, that very part of the *Eye* (to wit, *Pupilla Oculi*) wherewith we properly ſee, is deprined of all

Colours, to the end, that it may indifferently see all Colours: So should his vnderstanding (who eyther in this Mysterie of the Eucharist, or in any other, would sincerely behould the grounds, and reasons both of Catholikes, and Protestants) be voyded of all preiudice of iudgment, wherwith the Intellectuall faculty is otherwise discoloured, and blemished: for so shall he more clearly, and indifferently weigh, and consider the force of the seuerall Reasons, and Arguments produced on each side.

Lastly (to omit many other resemblances, and Proportions heerein) the (q) *Optickes* do teach, that one, and the same Colour doth appeare, as diuers, eyther to the same Eye, or to seuerall Eyes, according to the different *Angles* (to vse the imposed Phrase herein) *of Irradiation, or Incidency*, made by the entrance of the Obiect into the Eye: wherby we may be admonished, that in points of faith, one, and the same Authority doth seeme of a different weight, according as the Vnderstāding is afore either lightened with Gods Grace, or darkened with the myst of Passion. And thus far hereof: where we see, that the Body (contrary to the accustomed manner) is able to schoole, and instruct the soule.

Heere now I will conclude this first Part, in which the Reader hath all the chiefe obscurities of this great Mysterie explicated at large, and diuers of them paralelled by other acknowledged difficulties, both in Diuinity and Philosophy. For the close wherof I only wish him to haue his mind euer fixed in this one position, which is: That, *what Faculty, or Operation God doth impart to any thing created, the same he also* eminenter

retayneth

retaineth to himselfe (since otherwise the Creature should transcend in Might the Creatour) *and is able to performe it without the help of any secondary Cause:* being in such cases sole Agent of the same Effect: Which Axiome if he do apply to most of the (r) abstrusest Points in this Question of the Eucharist, he shall easily acknowledge, that the extending greatnesse of them, become confined by him who is only confined within his owne illimitable Power, and vnsearchable Wisdome: himselfe being the sole bound to himselfe.

(a) *Maximus Circulus.*] *Apud Euclidem.* Those Circles are called *Maiores Circuli*, whose *Center* is the same Céter with the Sphere wherof they are Circles. And this is the demonstration, why the Sunne being in the *Equinoctiall*, the day, and night is of an equall length in all places, to wit, because the *Horizon*, and the *Equinoctiall* are *Circuli Maiores*, hauing their Center the same with the Center of the world, and therfore intersecting themselues, they cut one the other into two equall parts: and consequently so much of that Circle which the Sunne then runneth, is vnder our *Horizon*, as is aboue our *Horizon*.

(b) *Quicquid in Deo* &c.] The reason hereof is (as is aboue touched) becausse to haue Proprietyes as Qualities, and Accidents, implyes composition, and imperfection: from which God is most free, as being *Maximè Vnus, & Simplex*.

(c) *The Psalmist.*] *Psalm.* 103.

(d) *Tunicles.*] There are six *Tunicæ*, or Skinnes, of which the Eye consisteth, to wit, 1. *Adnata* (otherwise called *Alba*) 2. *Innominata*. 3. *Sclerotides*, or *Cornea*. 4. *Vuea* (called also *Secundina*.) 5. *Amphiblistroides*, or *Retina*. 6. *Aranoides*, or *Arnuea*.

(e) (f) (g) *The Veynes* &c.] It is a Principle in Anatomy, that all Veines proceed from the Lyuer, and giue nourishment; all Arteries from the Heart, and giue life: all Synewes from the Braine, and giue Motion and Sense: I meane, that the grosse bloud in the Veines doth giue nourishment; the spirituall Bloud in the Arteries, life; and the Animall Spirits in the Nerues, or Synewes,

Synewes, Sense and Motion.

(h) *Opticke Synewes.*] These two *Opticke Synewes* are termed *Nerui visibiles*: by these the *Species*, or formes of all Obiects are carried from the Eyes to the *common Sense*.

(i) *Diuers Humors.*] There are three Humors in the Eye; 1. *Aqueus*, which is in the vttermost part of the Eye. 2. *Chrystallinus*, whose place is almost in the middle of the Eye; this Humor is almost the chiefest Instrument of seeing, and therefore it is called *Idolum*, or *Simulacrum Visionis*. 3. *Vitreus*, which is seated in the inmost part of the Eye: so as the Christalline Humor is placed betweene the *Vitreus* Humor, and the *Aqueus*.

(k) *Prouision.*
(l) *Ordure.*] For these Humors giue nourishment to some of the *Tunicles*, as also the Eye purgeth it selfe by the meanes of them.

(m) *Different Opinions.*] There are two chiefe Opinions touching the manner of seeing; The one, they call *Extramittendo*, that is, That the Eye doth send forth certayne *Spiritus visibiles* to the Obiect which the Eye seeth, and doe returne backe againe to the Eye with the true forme of the said Obiect. The other is *Intromittendo*, that is, That the *Species*, or formes of the Obiect are spherically multiplied in the Aire, or water, and are receaued in at the Eye *per medium Conoidis*, viz. in a Pyramidall manner.

(n) *The best Learned.*] The most Learned doe for the most part hold, that the Eye seeth after this second manner, to wit, *Intromittendo*.

(o) *Chiefest Philosophers.*] Many great Philosophers of our tyme doe teach, that such Accidences, which doe naturally continue their Inherence in that Body from which they first proceed, cannot naturally remoue from this their Subiect into another; such is the whitenesse in the Swanne, and the Blacknesse in a Crow &c. But their Iudgement is otherwise in those *Accidences* which haue their Inherence in another Subiect, then that, from which they originally proceeded; Such is the beames of the Sunne inhering in the Aire, and the formes of Obiects multiplied in the Aire: In these they hould, that the Beames of the Sunne, and the formes of the Obiects (being the same *numero*) may, and actually doe remoue from one part of the Aire into another, if so the Aire it selfe be changed: And their Reason hereof is this: For (say these Men) the beames of the Sunne, or the formes of Obiects, and the like, haue no affinity with the Aire in respect of their originall proceeding, but only by reason of existency. But any one part of the ayre is as indifferent, and ready to affoard them existence, as another part; Therefore (say they) there can be

no

no reason assigned, why such an Accident may not remoue from Aire to Aire, rather then through the chang only of the firster part of the Aire to be extinct.

(p) *But as one.*] The Reason hereof is, in that the sight of any thing is not perfectly performed, vntill the forme thereof be conuayed to the *common Sense*. Now this Conueyance is made by the meanes of *Nernus Opticus*, which *Neruus* doth deuide it selfe into two parts from the Forehead to either Eye: But from the Forehead to the *common Sense* it is but one; and therefore the forme of any Obiect being carried through this *Neruus Opticus*, doth represent the Obiect but as one (not as two) to the *common Sense*.

(q) *Optickes doe teach.*] So we see, that the different falling of the beames of the Sunne vpon the Cloude, which causeth the *Iris*, or Rainbow, doth cause to the eye the different representation of seuerall Colours; for as the Beames doe more, or lesse fall vpon the Cloud, so accordingly the Colours appeare varied to the Eye.

(r) *Most of the abstrusest Points.*] To instance this ground in some difficulties of the Eucharist; God hath imparted to a *Substance* the facultie of supporting, and sustentating an *Accidence* by meanes of Inherency; therefore it followeth out of this Principle, that God is able of himselfe to support an *Accident* without it *Subiect*, for otherwise he should giue more power, and ability to the Subiect, then he keepeth to himselfe, or can by himselfe performe, which were both impious, and absurd to maintaine. In like sort God hath giuen this property to *Place* (for the better conseruing of the *Subiect* conteyned) that it should circumscribe euery sublunary naturall Body with a certaine coextension answerable to the Quality of euery such body: Therefore God can of himselfe (as we belieue he doth in the Sacrament of the Eucharist) keep a Body without any such circumscription of place; since otherwise it would follow, that he hath so qualified this circumstance of place to performe that, which himselfe immediately cannot. This might be exemplified in many other difficulties touching the doctrine of the *Reall Presence*, neither is there found herein (in a cleare Iudgement) the least appearance of any Contradiction.

The end of the first Tract.

THE CHRISTIANS MANNA.

THE SECOND TRACT.

The Catholike doctrine of the Euchariſt *proued from the Figures therof in the Old Teſtament; from the Propheſies of the Rabbins; from the New Teſtament; from Miracles &c.*

CHAP. I.

IN the precedent Paſſages the poſſibility of the Catholike doctrine herein, is (I hope) moſt cleerly, and irrefragably proued, partly by ſolving all the abſtruſeſt difficulties, which are accuſtomed dangerously to inuade our Iudgment by the aſſault of the Eye, of other the ſenſes,

ſes, and of naturall Reaſon; and partly by ſhewing, that *God* ſtill is *God*, and his diuine Maieſty euer himſelfe, I meane, that he is in Power infinite, bourdleſſe, and inſcrutable; And that whenſoeuer this proud ſlyme of Man preſumes to aſſigne limits to him, by obiecting, that *Omnipotency* cannot paſſe it ſelfe, and the like; he endeauours but to graſpe the water, or to bind the Ayre, ſince he labours to reſtraine him (euen Him) whoſe *Ocean* euer flowes without any borrowed ſtreames, whoſe Day ſtil continues without enſuing Night, and whoſe *Center* is without any bordering *Circumference*.

It now remayneth briefly to demonſtrate, that not only it is poſſible, that Chriſts ſacred-Body, and Bloud may lye really vnder the formes of bread, and wine, but that actually in the Euchariſt ſo it doth. Which point, though it receaue it chiefeſt ſynewes, & ſtrength of proofe from the two Oracles of Gods written Word, to wit, from the Propheticall, and Apoſtolicall Scriptures; yet ſuch is the petulancy and wantonneſſe of our Aduerſaries in detorting thoſe ſacred Teſtimonyes, as that they tell vs, except we will admit their owne expoſitions of the ſaid Scriptures (though contrary to the words themſelues, and to all the acceſſarie circumſtances) we do but idely diuerberate the ayre with impertinent allegations.

And thus, Let vs produce ſuch Texts of God Word, which conteyne (euen by their owne confeſſions) the Types, or Figures of the holy Euchariſt during the time of the Law (which Tyme (a) ſerued but as the Eue to the greateſt Feſtiuall day of *Chriſtianitie*) as that it was ſhaddowed by the *Paſchall* (b) *Lambe*, by the (c) *Bloud of the Teſtament*, and by the *Manna* (d) deſcen-

descending from Heauen vpon the *Iewes*, wherein we affirme, that the accomplishment of these figures ought to be more noble, and worthy, then such naked representations, and that therefore if nothing be in the Sacrament but bread, and wine, it is not (e) better if not inferior to those Legall Figures, either in regard of their naturall substances, or their signification implied by them: Yea, let vs tell them, that they debase ouermuch the Iewish Sacraments, as teaching, that they did but adumbrate shaddowes, and represent Representations, since they account them no better, then Types of Types, and Figures of Figures; yet cannot this at all sway the iudgements of our Aduersaries, which is carried away violently with the streame of preiudice, and partiality.

Let vs bring forth the *Ancient* (f) *Rabbins*, most of them (if not all) liuing before our Sauiours Incarnation, who in a Propheticall spirit (directed no doubt by him, with whom their is no distinction of Tymes, though himselfe first distinguished Tymes) tell vs, that in the after dayes, the *Messias* himselfe shall offer vp his owne body, and bloud for sacrifice, vnder the formes of Bread, and Wyne; yet they proceed against them (and this is an ordinary disease, and distemperature of Heresy in other like cases) with a Lordly, and peremptorie Arrest, pronouncing, that such their writings are Suppositious (g) and Forged.

Let vs come to the Tyme of *Grace*, when we *Gentiles* first became *Antipodes* (as it were) to the *Iewes*; since our heauenly Sunne then setting to them, did instantly rise vnto vs, and lay downe Christs owne words, wherin he ordayned this most Reuerend, & high Mystorie, to wit, *Hoc* (h) *est Corpus meum*, &, *Hic est Sanguis meus*

&c. A text in respect of a (i) *Sacrament* instituted herein, of a *Testament* (k) left therby, and of a *Precept*, (l) and *Position* of faith contayned therin (euer to continue in the Church) necessarily challenging a literall, plaine, and obuious Interpretation: Yet our Tropicall, and Figuratiue Sectaries are not heere affraid (o monstrous impiety!) euen to force, and violate with their strained Glosses the true sense therof.

Let vs examine the former words, by recurring to the Greeke, wherin the Euangelists (our Lords true Historians) did first write, to wit, τὸ (m) ποτήριον, ὃ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον; where the words do by all naturall Construction signifie, that the Cup was shed for vs, and consequently that Wyne was not in the Cup. They reply, that the words (heere making for vs) are meere (n) surreptitious, and in tyme by negligence crept out of the margent into the text; thus daring in a supercilious, and impudent manner, to expunge out of the holy Writ it selfe, what may seeme to eneruate, and destroy their Typicall Communion.

Let vs passe on further to such Texts of the Apostle, which do imply an vse, and practice of the *Eucharist*; as, *Calix* (o) *benedictionis, cui benedicimus, nonne communicatio Sanguinis Christi est? Et Panis quem frangimus, nonne cõmunicatio Corporis Christi est?* As also the said Apostle in another place, *Qui* (p) *manducat, & bibit indignè, iudicium sibi manducat, & bibit, non dijudicans Corpus Domini*. And againe he there saith, that such an one, *reus erit Corporis, & Sanguinis Domini*: In all which words the often, and reuerent ingemination of flesh, of bloud, of the Body of Christ, of the most dreadfull comminations, and threats to the vnworthy receauers therof, may seeme well to Paraphrase

raphrase, and comment our Sauiours owne words, and to free them frō all ambiguous acceptation: Yet do they most pertinaciously persist in their former Allegoricall Constructions, abastarding therby the native, and genuine sense therof.

Let vs not only fortify our doctrine with the warrant of Gods word, but also repell all weake assaults, & forces, gathered out of certaine wrested Texts of the said Word, for the impugning of this our faith; for thus do our Aduersaries bandie Scripture against Scripture, as if the Pennes of the Euangelists, and the Apostles had at vnawares made some blots, or blurres of contradictions or mistakings.

Now to this their drift many Passages are vrged by them; As first, diuers (q) Examples (to countermaund the naturall construction of the words of the Institution) wherin by the word *Est*, is vnderstood *Significat*. In like sort they obiect, where it is said, That the Eucharist is *to be taken in* (r) *Remembrance of Christ*; That, *Christ shall not leaue* (s) *Heauen, till the consummation of the world*; That Christ to shew himselfe to haue a true Body consisting of flesh, and bones &c. *would haue it touched* (t), *and felt*; That the Eucharist euen after Consecration is called (u) *Bread*; That the Iewes (who receaued not the Eucharist) did neuertheless *eate the same spirituall* (x) *meate with Christians*; That whatsoeuer *entreth in* (y) *at the mouth, is to haue it ordinary*, and naturall passage with common meates. Finally, that our Sauiour himselfe affirmes, *that it is the spirit* (z) *which quickeneth, and that the flesh profiteth nothing*. Let vs (I say) display at full, how in these Texts, they euen diuorce the letter from the true sense of the Holy Ghost, and that they are so impertinently,

&c. A text in respect of a (i) *Sacrament* instituted herein, of a *Testament* (k) left therby, and of a *Precept*, (l) and *Position* of faith contayned therin (euer to continue in the Church) necessarily challenging a literall, plaine, and obuious Interpretation: Yet our Tropicall, and Figuratiue Sectaries are not heere affraid (o monstrous impiety!) euen to force, and violate with their strained Glosses the true sense therof.

Let vs examine the former words, by recurring to the Greeke, wherin the Euangelists (our Lords true Historians) did first write, to wit, τὸ (m) ποτήριον, ὃ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον; where the words do by all naturall Construction signifie, that the Cup was shed for vs, and consequently that Wyne was not in the Cup. They reply, that the words (heere making for vs) are meere (n) surreptitious, and in tyme by negligence crept out of the margent into the text; thus daring in a supercilious, and impudent manner, to expunge out of the holy Writ it selfe, what may seeme to eneruate, and destroy their Typicall Communion.

Let vs passe on further to such Texts of the Apostle, which do imply an vse, and practice of the *Eucharist*; as, *Calix* (o) *benedictionis, cui benedicimus, nonne communicatio Sanguinis Christi est? Et Panis quem frangimus, nonne cõmunicatio Corporis Christi est?* As also the said Apostle in another place, *Qui* (p) *manducat, & bibit indignè, iudicium sibi manducat, & bibit, non dijudicans Corpus Domini*. And againe he there saith, that such an one, *reus erit Corporis, & Sanguinis Domini*: In all which words the often, and reuerent ingemination of flesh, of bloud, of the Body of Christ, of the most dreadfull comminations, and threats to the vnworthy receauers therof, may seeme well to Paraphrase

raphrase, and comment our Sauiours owne words, and to free them frō all ambiguous acceptation: Yet do they most pertinaciously persist in their former Allegoricall Constructions, abastarding therby the native, and genuine sense therof.

Let vs not only fortify our doctrine with the warrant of Gods word, but also repell all weake assaults, & forces, gathered out of certaine wrested Texts of the said Word, for the impugning of this our faith; for thus do our Aduersaries bandie Scripture against Scripture, as if the Pennes of the Euangelists, and the Apostles had at vnawares made some blots, or blurres of contradictions or mistakings.

Now to this their drift many Passages are vrged by them; As first, diuers (q) Examples (to countermaund the naturall construction of the words of the Institution) wherin by the word *Est*, is vnderstood *Significat*. In like sort they obiect, where it is said, That the Eucharist is *to be taken in* (r) *Remembrance of Christ*; That, *Christ shall not leaue* (s) *Heauen, till the consummation of the world*; That Christ to shew himselfe to haue a true Body consisting of flesh, and bones &c. *would haue it touched* (t), *and felt*; That the Eucharist euen after Consecration is called (u) *Bread*; That the Iewes (who receaued not the Eucharist) did neuertheless *eate the same spirituall* (x) *meate with Christians*; That whatsoeuer *entreth in* (y) *at the mouth, is to haue it ordinary*, and naturall passage with common meates. Finally, that our Sauiour himselfe affirmes, *that it is the spirit* (z) *which quickeneth, and that the flesh profiteth nothing*. Let vs (I say) display at full, how in these Texts, they euen diuorce the letter from the true sense of the Holy Ghost, and that they are so impertinently,

nently, or forcedly applyed by them, as that they appeare hereby (to vse the Prophets Idiome) (a) *in sua fortitudine confusi*, their weakenesse thus rising out of their imaginarie strength, yet as men desirous still to intertaine further contestation, and dispute, they neuer cease to make their sallyes, and attempts out of these weake fortresses; thus heere enlarging ouermuch the sense of the letter, where it is to be rather straitned, as afore straitning it, when it was to be enlarged, and euer forgetting, that (notwithstanding all contrary machinations of Sectaries whatsoeuer) it is recorded in the Scripture, that (b) *Scriptura non potest solui*.

Let vs (laying aside the written Word) alledge the diuers, stupendious, and astonishing *Miracles* (Gods peculiar Language, & Dialect, wherein he immediately speaketh to Man, persuading him without words, and instructing him without Letters, or Characters) whereby his Diuine Godnesse hath vouchsafed to seale vp the truth of this high Mysterie (for heere we may break forth with the Psalmist, (c) *Mirabilia testimonia tua*) and these not borrowed out of any fabulous Legend, nor grounded vpon vncertaine hear-sayes, but on the graue testimonies of most ancient, and learned Authors, and circumstanced with tyme, place, persons, and other particulers of Morall Certaintie.

Examples hereof are diuers: As that the *B. Sacrament*, in proofe of our Catholike doctrine, hath cured (d) possessed persons. That it hath (to the same end) appeared sometimes in the forme of a (e) true humane shape. That the misbelieuers, or doubters therein haue beene (f) punished by God, euen with death.

Lastly (to omit some of other kinds) that the truth here-

hereof hath beene confirmed by the testimonies (such as they could giue) euen of (g) brute Beasts (for it is said, (h) *Glorificabit me Bestia agri:*) Thus Creatures, which want Reason, haue heere exceeded in vse thereof Men, who only enioy Reason: Yet doe they hould all such narrations but as forged wonders, and condemne with a censorious temeritie the belieuers of such, of a meere doting (i) credulity; or at the most repute them, as prestigious (k) sleights of the Diuell. But heere by the way, we are to aduertise them, that if indeed, there were euer any such Miracles exhibited for the confirmation of the Catholike faith herein, then is their Sacramentarian Heresy to be vtterly abolished; If none such were euer performed, then what greater Miracle, then that an Article of Faith mainly impugning all sense, and yet not warranted by any Miracle, should for so many ages generally be belieued? Or what stronger Reason in defence thereof, then for it to be vnanimously imbraced, and receaued, being aboue Reason?

Let vs shew, That as God was before the Diuell, so Truth (which receaueth her emanation, and flowing from God, the *first Truth*) is more ancient then falshood, the attendant of those Apostating, & reuolted spirits.

Thus is *Antiquity* the badge of *Truth*, and *Noueltie* of *Errour*. Now, that the Catholike Faith of the *Eucharist* is more ancient, then the Sacramentarian Heresy, we proue euen from the Nature of the Conception, Birth, and Growth of euery Innouation of Faith. Of our Faith there can be no instance pretended, when first it (l) beganne, and entered into the Church; whereas of the other, we are able to note the *Author* who first did disseminate it, to wit, *Berengarius* (m) Archdeacon of *Angiers*:

gieris. The *Tyme* when: Anno 1051. The *place* where: *France*. The *paucity* (at the first beginning) of his followers; some few schollers first allured to him by gifts. The astonishment of the Church hereat, as wondering at so strange a Paradoxe (like men gazing at a new appearing Comet:) And lastly the (n) *Contradictiõ*, Opposition, & *Censure* of the Church giuen against his doctrine in ten (o) seuerall Councells, his Heresie being condemned in them all, and himselfe personally Anathematized in some of them: So deseruedly was he deprived of the Communion of the Holy Church, since he laboured to deprive the Church of her *Holy Communion*.

Adde hereto, for the greater accession of reasons herein, that he was so irresolute in this his Opinion, as that he did abiure it three seuerall tymes; so forsaking his faith twice (for so often he reuolted after his Oath taken) with breach of Faith, though finally he dyed therein Catholike. And thus much of the first origen of the Sacramentarian Heresie, from whence it appeareth, that it is of a far later Date, then our Catholike Faith; the discouery of all which particulers doth sufficiently argue the falshood therof; since it is true, that to reduce an Heresie to the beginning therof, is a confutation of the said Heresie: Let vs (I say) alledge all this, yet will our Aduersaries maintayne the former Innouator, though not as an Inuentor of any New Heresie, but as a Restorer (forsooth) of a former more ancient Faith: whereas indeed it is most certaine, that before the reuolt of *Berengarius*, this rare *Vtopian* Nouelist, iumping in doctrine with *Berengarius*, and our Sacramentaries, was (p) neuer heard of in any place or tyme.

And as touching so many Councells condemning

Berengarius, they reiect, and traduce them all most vnworthily, affirming them either to be Schismaticall, or at the most but Men, and therin subiect to Errour. Fye of this Iewish obstinacy of our Sectarie, who spurnes at the alledged Testimonies of whole Councells (the highest Tribunalls in Gods Church) because they are but Men, and yet himselfe expecteth (for Heresie cannot subsist without Pride) that others should sweare fealtie to his Iudgment, being but the seely weening of one Man.

Lastly, let vs demaund of thē (that seeing they cānot be induced to admit our Interpretation of Scripture, nor any other afore alledged Authorities or Reasons; and seeing it is against the custome of al Schooles, & against Reason it selfe, that the Parties should become their own Iudges, & that they relying only vpon Scripture, themselues only should expound Scripture) whether they will be pleased to acknowledge for Vmpiers in this point the most ancient and learned Fathers; Men in their life time, though much disterminated by Sea, and Land, yet all breathing one, and the same Faith; And though Neutralls to our present factions, yet parties (no doubt) to the causes of the said factions: Finally such, as we (who now liue in these Autumnall, and decaying dayes of the Church) may in their writings be able to glasse the face, and beauty of Christs intemerate Spouse, I meane, the purity, and integrity of the faith of Christians, during the Petiod of the Primitiue Church. But heere euen at the sound, and name of the Primitiue Church, our Aduersaries grow pale, and yet they blush; they are affraid to accept of these conditions, as men guilty to themselues of their future ouerthrow; and yet they are ashamed,

that the world should at length discerne, that they refuse so reasonable an offer, and that they must needes breake with that Illustrious and Famous Church, the rayes and beames whereof being sent so farre off, doe reflect a greater heate of admiration and reuerence, then such, as are neerer at hand can performe.

In these straights, present shame preponderating, and waighing downe with them all after-dangers, they accept of this our proffer, and so (like Bank-rupts vaunting most of their riches, before their neere approaching breach) they pretend great (q) Confidence in the Fathers (poore men, well knowing, that they are wounded almost with euery splinter, and little passage of their writings:) And which is ridiculous, some of them giue out (such is the Serpentine malice of Heresie) that we eyther in this Controuersy, or any other, are vnwilling to submit our selues to the sentence & finall determination of the Fathers, and dare not endure the touch of such a proofe. From which vnworthie recrimination we all so farre disclaime, as that euen in this question heere controuerted we will be content, indisputably to resigne our Iudgements to the Iudgements of the Fathers; so willingly we remember, that it is said (r) *Interroga de diebus antiquis*.

Therefore in the subsequent Chapters, I will set downe such materiall, and weightie Testimonies of them, as we produce in defence of our Faith herein; and will satisfy such their obscure sayings; wherein our Aduersaries doe chiefly insist for the impugning of the same: and lastly I will proue by the confessions euen of their owne Brethren, that the writings of the Fathers, do altogeather fortify, and confirme the Catholike,

Faith in this high Mysterie: So shall the impartiall Reader perceaue, that falshood is euer supported with falshood, and Heresy begun with lyes, doth finally end with lyes, like vnto watrie *Meteors*, which still resolue into that, of which they were first engendred.

(a) *VVhich Tyme serued.*] According to that, *Omnia ista contingebant in figuris*. 1. Cor. c. 7.

(b) *Paschall Lambe.* Exod. 12.] S. *Augustine* saith of this Figure, l. 2. contra literas Petiliani cap. 37. *Aliud Pascha, quod Iudæi de one celebrant, aliud quod nos in corpore, & sanguine Domini accipimus.*] That the *Paschall Lambe* was a figure of the Eucharist is further testified by *Leo Serm. 7. de Passione Domini*, by *Cyprian, lib. de Vnitate Ecclesiæ*, by *Chrysostome homil. de proditione Iudæ*, by *Hierome in c. 26. Matth.* by *Tertullian l. 4. in Marcionem*, and diuers others.

(c) *The bloud of the Testament.* Exod. 24.] That this bloud was a figure of the Eucharist appeareth out of *Luc.* 22. where our Sauiour plainly saith, *Hic calix nouum Testamentum est in meo Sanguine*: In like sort *Matth.* 26. Our Lord in these words (*Hic est Sanguis meus noui Testamenti*) seemeth in both places to allude to the words of *Moyses*: *Hic est Sanguis Testamenti, quem misit ad vos Deus* Now, heere it cannot be replyed, that the bloud of the Testament was a Figure only of the Passion, and not of the Eucharist, and the reason hereof is this, in that a Testament ought to be made by a free man, before his death, and by some publique Instrument, for the remembrance thereof after the Testators death. All which circumstances are more truly, and liuely found in the Institution of the Sacrament, then in his Passion.

(d) *Manna descending.*] Of this we read *Exod.* 16. That the *Manna* was a Figure of the *Eucharist*, appeareth from our Sauiours owne words *Ioan.* 6. *Patres vestri manducauerunt Manna in Deserto, & mortui sunt: Qui manducant hunc Panem, viuent in æternum.* The same is confirmed by the Fathers: See hereof *Ambrose l. 5. de Sacramen. c. 1.* and, *De iis qui initiantur Mysterijs. c. 8. & 9. Augustine, Theophylact, Cyril*, and *Chrysostome in c. 6. Ioannis.*

(e) *It is not better.*] That these Figures are not inferior (if not superior) to the Eucharist (if nothing be there, but Bread, and Wine) either for substance, or signification, it is most cleare. And first touching the *Paschall Lambe*, If we consider a Lambe, and Bread,

that the world should at length discerne, that they refuse so reasonable an offer, and that they must needes breake with that Illustrious and Famous Church, the rayes and beames whereof being sent so farre off, doe reflect a greater heate of admiration and reuerence, then such, as are neerer at hand can performe.

In these straights, present shame preponderating, and waighing downe with them all after-dangers, they accept of this our proffer, and so (like Bank-rupts vaunting most of their riches, before their neere approaching breach) they pretend great (q) Confidence in the Fathers (poore men, well knowing, that they are wounded almost with euery splinter, and little passage of their writings:) And which is ridiculous, some of them giue out (such is the Serpentine malice of Heresie) that we eyther in this Controuersy, or any other, are vnwilling to submit our selues to the sentence & finall determination of the Fathers, and dare not endure the touch of such a proofe. From which vnworthie recrimination we all so farre disclaime, as that euen in this question heere controuerted we will be content, indisputably to resigne our Iudgements to the Iudgements of the Fathers; so willingly we remember, that it is said (r) *Interroga de diebus antiquis*.

Therefore in the subsequent Chapters, I will set downe such materiall, and weightie Testimonies of them, as we produce in defence of our Faith herein; and will satisfy such their obscure sayings; wherein our Aduersaries doe chiefly insist for the impugning of the same: and lastly I will proue by the confessions euen of their owne Brethren, that the writings of the Fathers, do altogeather fortify, and confirme the Catholike,

Faith in this high Mysterie: So shall the impartiall Reader perceaue, that falshood is euer supported with falshood, and Heresy begun with lyes, doth finally end with lyes, like vnto watrie *Meteors*, which still resolue into that, of which they were first engendred.

(a) *Which Tyme serued.*] According to that, *Omnia eis contingebant in figuris.* 1. Cor. c. 7.

(b) *Paschall Lambe.* Exod. 12.] S. *Augustine* saith of this Figure, l. 2. contra literas Petiliani cap. 37. *Aliud Pascha, quod Iudæi de oue celebrant, aliud quod nos in corpore, & sanguine Domini accipimus.*] That the *Paschall Lambe* was a figure of the Eucharist is further testified by *Leo Serm. 7. de Passione Domini*, by *Cyprian, lib. de Vnitate Ecclesiæ*, by *Chrysostome homil. de proditione Iudæ*, by *Hierome in c. 26. Matth.* by *Tertullian l. 4. in Marcionem*, and diuers others.

(c) *The bloud of the Testament.* Exod. 24.] That this bloud was a figure of the Eucharist appeareth out of *Luc.* 22. where our Sauiour plainly saith, *Hic calix nouum Testamentum est in meo Sanguine.* In like sort *Matth.* 26. Our Lord in these words (*Hic est Sanguis meus noui Testamenti*) seemeth in both places to allude to the words of *Moyses: Hic est Sanguis Testamenti, quem misit ad vos Deus* Now, heere it cannot be replyed, that the bloud of the Testament was a Figure only of the Passion, and not of the Eucharist, and the reason hereof is this, in that a Testament ought to be made by a free man, before his death, and by some publique Instrument, for the remembrance thereof after the Testators death. All which circumstances are more truly, and liuely found in the Institution of the Sacrament, then in his Passion.

(d) *Manna descending.*] Of this we read *Exod.* 16. That the *Manna* was a Figure of the *Eucharist*, appeareth from our Sauiours owne words *Ioan. 6. Patres vestri manducauerunt Manna in Deserto, & mortui sunt: Qui manducant hunc Panem, viuent in æternum.* The same is confirmed by the Fathers: See hereof *Ambrose l. 5. de Sacramen. c. 1.* and, *De ijs qui initiantur Mysterijs. c. 8. & 9. Augustine, Theophylact, Cyril*, and *Chrysostome in c. 6. Ioannis.*

(e) *It is not better.*] That these Figures are not inferior (if not superior) to the Eucharist (if nothing be there, but Bread, and Wine) either for substance, or signification, it is most cleare. And first touching the *Paschall Lambe*, If we consider a Lambe, and Bread,

as things naturall, the Lamb (as being a Creature endued with sense) is more noble. And if we consider them as Sacraments, that is, as externall signes, the Lamb also excelleth Bread: for the Flesh of Christ is better represented by the flesh of the Lamb, then by Bread. Againe, the death of Christ is more liuely figured by the killing of the Lambe, then by breaking of Bread. Finally, the Innocency, & other Proprieties of Christ are better signified by a Lamb without any spot (for such the Law commaunded to be sacrificed) then by Bread. In like sort, the effect of the Sacramēt is better obtained by the eating of the Lamb, then by eating of bread: for if the effect therof be a spirituall nutrition, we know, that flesh nourisheth better then bread; and if it be only a stirring vp of a Mans faith, then doth the killing of the Lambe performe it better, in that it more liuely setteth forth the death of Christ.

Concerning the *Bloud of the Testament*, the same former Reasons, which did proue the Lambe to be more noble then Bread, do also serue to proue, that bloud is better (both for substance & signification) then the Eucharist, if nothing be there but Wine: for Bloud is a more noble substance, then Wine, & the Bloud of Christ is better represented by bloud, then by wine. Touching the *Manna*, It is in like sort most cleare, that supposing the Eucharist to containe in it only bread, it is inferiour to the *Mana*. And first considering their natures, and essences, the *Manna* it most excellent, as being made by the hands of the Angells, descending from heauen, and hauing in it all kind of tastes, or so tasting, as euery one eating therof would desire. And according to these points, we find it called *Panis Angelorum*, *Psal.* 77. and *Panis de Cælo*, *Ioan.* 6. wheras bread is made by the hands of a Baker, comming out of an Ouen, and hauing only but the tast of bread. In like sort if *Manna*, and bread be considered as externall Symboles, and signes, *Manna* representeth, or signifieth Christ better then bread, in that it came from heauen, was indued with all kinds of tastes, and was receaued of euery one in a like measure. Thus we see, that the Figures in the old Law, do euery way excel the Eucharist (they being but Types of the same) if so nothing be therin, but bread. Now it is euident euen in reason, that Figures ought to be inferiour to those things wher of they are Figures; which point also appeareth out of the Apostle *Colos.* 2. who there compareth the Figures of the old Testament to the shaddowes, and the fulfilling of the said figures to the body.

Now, wheras our Aduersaries do answere to our Argument, in saying, that our Sacraments (and consequently the *Eucharist*) do excell the Sacraments of the old Law (euen with reference had only to the externall signes) because (say they) our Sacraments are more firme, as neuer againe to be altered; and because they shew, and figure

out a thing already done, and not hereafter only to be done, and because they are more simple, and belong to a greater multitude of people: and lastly, in that they are more cleere then the other, not so much in regard of externall representation, as for the euidency, and cleerneſſe of the words there ſpoken. This is the anſwere of our Aduerſaries, and particularly of *Peter Martyr in ſua defenſ. de Euchariſt. part. 3. pag. 692.* But this taketh not away the force of our Arguments: for all theſe Prerogatiues of our Sacraments, aſcribed by him, are extrinſecall, and accidentary to Sacraments, as they are Symboles, and Signes; ſeeing that they altogeather depend of the bare will of him, who did firſt inſtitute, & ordaine them; & therfore they bring ſmall, or no dignity to ſignes, as they are ſigns: but the compariſon is to be made in the ſignification it ſelfe, in ſeeking the internall dignity, and worth of ſignes, for thoſe ſignes are better, which better do ſignify: but ſignes do ſignify better, or worſe in regard only of their externall ſignification.

Adde hereto, that when our Sauiour did firſt inſtitute the *Euchariſt*, his death was to come, and conſequently it did then figure a thing to come.

Laſtly adde, that the Scripture, and the Fathers do not teach, that our Sacraments do not excell the old Sacraments, becauſe they better ſignify, but becauſe they were but as figures, and the Euchariſt the thing figured, ſo as the compariſon made both in Scriptures, and by the Fathers, is the compariſon of the things abſolutely in themſelues, without any reference had of the ſignification of them.

(f) *Ancient Rabbins.*] Among the *Rabbins*, which haue propheſied hereof, we find, that *Rabbi Symeon, lib. Reuelat. Secretorũ*, thus ſaith, *The Sacrifice, which after the Meſſias his comming Prieſts ſhall make &c. they ſhall make it of bread, and wine &c. and that Sacrifice, which ſhall be ſo celebrated vpon euery Altar, ſhall be turned into the body of the Meſſias.*] *Rabbi Cahana, ad cap. 40. Geneſ.* writeth, *That the Sacrifices which ſhalbe offered of Wine, ſhall not only be changed into the ſubſtance of the Bloud of the Meſſias, but alſo into the ſubſtance of his Body. The Sacrifice, which ſhall be of Bread, notwithſtanding it be white as milke, it ſhall be conuerted into the Body of the Meſſias.*] *Rabbi Barachias, in Eccleſiaſt.* affirmeth, *That, at the comming of the Meſſias, food ſhall come from heauen like a little cake.*] Finally, *Rabbi Hadarſan, in Pſal. 136.* (to omit the teſtimonyes of others) writeth: *Taſt, and ſee, how good is God; for the bread, which he giueth to all, is his Fleſh, and whileſt it is taſted, it is conuerted into his Fleſh.*] So cleare theſe Iewes were in this point, that *Galatinus* (who vrgeth theſe their ſayings) writeth of them, *That they may be thought not ſo much to haue foretould things to come, as to haue*

reported

reported Euangelist-like things already done.].

(g) *Suppositious and Forged.*] All these testimonies of the Rabbins (besides many moe) are recorded by *Galatinus*, *de arcanis Catholicæ Veritatis l.* 10. *c.* 5. 6. 7. *&c.* Yet Doctor *Whitaker* absolutely reiecteth them *l.* 9. *contra Duræum*, *pag.* 818. And yet the sayings of the said Iewes in other points (recorded by the former *Galatinus*) are of such weight in the iudgements of other learned Protestants, as that we do find them vrged in their bookes against their Aduersaries. Thus we find them produced by *Parkes* against *Willet pag.* 170. by *Philip Mornay* in his booke *Touching the trueneſſe of Christian Religion*, and englished *Anno* 1592. *pag.* 434. 436. and in diuers pages following. In like sort by *Paulus Phagius* a Protestant, touching *Traditions* deliuered by word of mouth; and finally by the silenced Ministers *in their defense of their Reasons for their refusall of subscription*, *pag.* 188. If then the authorities be of force to be alledged by the Protestants for proofe of other points, shall they not be of the like weight being produced for iustifying of our Catholike doctrine in this Controuersy?

Now, whereas some of our Aduersaries to maintaine, that these, and other like sayings for iustifying of Christian Religion, were first forged by *Galatinus*, or some of his time, and fathered vpon the Iewes for their greater credit; this is most false: for we find, that one *Hieronymus de sancta Fide*, beihg a Iew, and conuerted to Christianity in the time of *Pope Benedict the* 13. (which was a good time before *Galatinus*) whose Phisitian he was, wrote a booke entituling it, *Hebræo-maſtyx*, or *Vindex Impietatis*, *ac Perfidiæ Iudaicæ*: wherein he proueth diuers pointsof Christianity from the three alledged Testimonyes, and Sentences of the said former Iewes mentioned by *Galatinus*. This booke of his is printed at *Franckford Anno* 1602.

(h) *Hoc eſt Corpus meum.*] The Reall Presence is euidently proued out of these words of the Institution, recorded by all the Euangelists. And first to giue a short Exposition of euery such word therein, which may inforce the true Presence of Christs body, we say, and teach thus.

The Pronowne H o c, must be taken heere, either *Adiectiuely*, or *Substantiuely*; if it be to be taken *Adiectiuely*, then it is to agree with some Substantiue, and consequently it must demonstrate *Corpus*, and not *Panis*, because the word *Panis* (being in Greeke ἄρτος) is in both tongues of the masculine Gender. And yet this Pronowne being in Greeke τοῦτο, vsed heere by the Euangelists, and in Latin *Hoc*, is in both the said Tongues of the Neuter Gender; so in the other sentence following, *Hic eſt Sanguis meus*, the Pronowne *Hic*, cannot demonstrate *Vinum*, because *Vinum* is of the Neuter Gender. Now if

the

the particle *Hoc*, be taken substantiuely, then *Hoc* must heere signifie *Hæc Res*, but that this word *Hoc*, or *Hæc res*, should predicate of the bread there present, were ridiculous and absurd, for we doe not vsually say *Hoc*, signifying *Hæc res*, if the thing be present, and knowne, except the said thing be of the Neuter Gender: and the reason hereof is, in that seeing the *Subiectum* ought to be more knowne, then the *Predicatum*, if therefore the *Subiectum* be knowne to the hearers in particuler, it ought not to be deliuered by an vniuersall Name, but only then it is so vniuersally to be deliuered, when it is only knowne in generall. Therefore seeing the Apostles did at the Last Supper see bread in our Sauiours hands, and knew it to be bread, it had beene an absurd kind of speach, if our Sauiour had said of the bread, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, since he ought to haue said, *Hic Panis est Corpus meum*.

This point is also made more euident out of the Greeke Text: for if *Hoc* should haue demonstrated Bread, then by the same reason, the Pronowne *Hic*, in these words, *Hic est Sanguis meus*, should demonstrate *Vinum*, and not *Sanguis*. But S. *Luke* is manifestly against this second point, who *cap.* 22. thus saith: Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον. viz. *Hic Calix nouum Testamentum in Sanguine meo, qui pro vobis effunditur*, where the words in Greeke signifying, *qui effunditur*, are not ioyned in construction with those words, *in Sanguine meo*, but with the other words *Hic Calix*. Therefore whereas S. *Luke* saith, that the Cup was shed for vs (but the Cup it selfe, or the wine in the Cup is not shed for vs but the bloud of Christ) it followeth that *Calix* heere doth not signifie a Cup of wine, but a Cup of bloud: Therefore it remaineth by force of inference of the former premises, that the Pronowne *Hoc* in the words of the Institution doth demonstrate not *Bread*, but that which is conteyned vnder the *species*, and forme of bread, the which thing, though afore it was bread, yet after the words ended, and perfected by our Lord, it was the body of Christ.

Touching the Verbe (Est) in the said words of the Institution, which word our Aduersaries doe striue to proone, that it is heere taken for *Significat*, whereas the Catholikes doe teach, that the word *Est* implyeth heere no other signification, then it owne naturall signification.

Now this is proued; First, because we find not Tropes, or Figures to be placed in *Verbes*, but by reason of some peculiar thing, or nature, which is implyed in one Verbe, and not in another: but the Verbe *Est* signifieth nothing else, then a Coniunction of one thing with another, or a comaion being incident to all things. Againe, this Verb

Est, can neuer leaue it owne signification, in that it is the *Copula* of all Propositions. Therfore since of necessity it is in euery Proposition, it cannot leaue it owne signification, and receaue another. Lastly, and chiefly, this Verbe hath the most simple, and most common signification, so as all other Verbes may be resolued into it, and something besides; Thus *Vocat legit*, id est, *Est legens*: hence it followeth, that this verbe *Est* (because it being the most simple of all Verbes, cannot be resolued into it selfe, and something besides) cannot be drawne to receaue the signification of any other Verb. Now against this doctrine, the example of words obiected, where *Est* is taken ordinarily for *Significat*, presupposeth nothing. As for example, *Præcepti, est Orare*, the reason heereof being, in that the essence of a signe is signification, therfore in all such Propositions by the Verbe *Est*, is vnderstood the essence of the same signe. Now then, seing in those said former examples, and propositions one signe doth predicate of another (for words are nothing else but signes) it followeth, that the Verbe *Est* is taken for *Significat*, and yet without any Trope therin.

Touching the word CORPVS, in which word most of our Aduersaries do choose rather to place the figure, then in the former Verbe *Est*: Now, that this word *Corpus* can not signifie *figurum Corporis* (as our Aduersaries pretend) is most euident. And, first this is proued out of the words following, to wit, *Quod pro vobis datur*, in Greeke being for the word *datur*, [illegible] as also out of those other following touching the Cup, *Qui pro vobis effunditur*, in Greeke [illegible]. Now, these two Greeke Participles, being put in the Nominatiue case, ought to be ioyned with a Substantiue of the same case, therfore they are to be ioyned in construction with that which is called *Corpus*, and *Sanguis*, and not with any words put in other cases, as *Corporis*, and *Sanguinis*; Therfore either the true Body, & Blood is in the Eucharist, or his Body by way of representation, and signification only, to wit, the Bread, and Wine were giuen for vs, and shed for vs, which is absurd to affirme.

Secondly, the same is proued from the former obseruations touching the Pronowne *Hoc*, for seing that this Pronowne doth not demonstrate *Bread*, there is nothing else, of which these words *figura Corporis* should predicate, except they will say, that the true and naturall Body of Christ is a signe, and figure of it selfe.

Lastly, the Body of Christ, wheresoeuer it is read in Scripture, is eyther taken for his *Mysticall Body*, to wit, the Church, or for his true, and naturall Body: but for a signe, and figure of his body, we neuer find it to be taken. Therfore the Constructions of the Sacramentaries giuen of the words of the Institution is most forced, & without

any

any example, or president of that kind throughout the whole Scripture. But the more euidently to proue, that the words of the Institution cannot be taken figuratiuely, I do further present (besides what hath beene already alledged) to the Reader these few ensuing Obseruations.

First, that this Pronowne *Hoc*, designing some particuler thing, preuents all Figuratiue constructions: And therfore we find, that in other acknowledged Metaphoricall speaches of Christ touching himselfe, the Pronowne *Hoc* is wanting, as in these, *Ego sum Ostium*, *Ego sum Vitis* &c.

Secondly, In all Metaphoricall speaches, that are vsed by way of Explication, it is not accustomed, that one thing do predicate, or be affirmed of another thing, except the *Prædicatum* be some such thing, in the which the propriety (according to the which the similitude of the Metaphor is chiefly intended) is more knowne and euident, then it is in the other thing, of the which the said Metaphor is affirmed. And this is the reason, that in Metaphoricall Propositions one thing doth predicate of another, for the most part *in genere*, or *in specie* at least; But no such obseruation is heere found in the words of the Institution. For heere (according to our Aduersaries) the Body, and Bloud of Christ are affirmed of Bread, and Wine, and yet the vertue of nourishing (which they heere assigne to be the ground of the supposed figuratiue speach) is lesse euident and knowne in the Body and Bloud of Christ, then in the Bread and Wine, which before his pronouncing of the words, Christ did houle in his hands.

Thirdly, It is to be obserued, that in the words of the Institution, the Body and Bloud of Christ do not expressly predicate, or are affirmed of Bread and Wine, but only they do predicate of a word signifying some thing, but with confusion and vncertainty, to wit, of the Pronowne *Hoc*. And yet in other metaphoricall speaches euer a thing which is of one nature, doth predicate of another thing of a different nature, as *Christus erat petra* &c.

Fourthly, we are heere to note the words following, to wit, *quod pro vobis datur*, *qui pro vobis effunditur* &c. Which are added to demonstrate the truth and propriety of the precedent Affirmation. But in all Metaphoricall Affirmations nothing for the most part is wont to be added, but what doth more clearly expresse the propriety of that thing, from the similitude wherof the Metaphor is drawne.

Thus one may say, *Cæsar was a Lion, by reason of his courage & fortitude*, which later words are added to expresse more cleerly the nature of the Metaphor. But now if the addition of words following, doth not explicate the similitude of a Metaphor, but absolutely doth shew the truth of the thing therin affirmed, then doth such an Addi-

tion manifest withall the Propriety of the precedent affirmation; as in these words: *That Christ suffered vpon the Crosse, who was borne of a Virgin*, where we find, that the later words not expressing any similitude of a Metaphor, do intimate a Propriety and literall acception of the former words concerning Christ. In like sort we say, that those words: *Quod pro vobis tradetur, &c. Qui pro vobis fundetur &c. VVhich shalbe deliuered for you &c.* and, *VVhich shall be shed for you &c.* do not import and signify any vertue of nourishing, which they should haue done, if the Propositions (to which they are adioyned) had bene Metaphoricall: but they do signify, that Christs Body and Bloud were the pryce of our Redemption, which point hath no necessary coniunction with the vertue and faculty of nourishing. And thus much in further explication of the word of the Institution.

(i) *A Sacrament instituted heerin.*] Sacraments are accustomed to be instituted by God in most plaine words, least otherwise we should erre in the vse thereof, as appeareth by the Examples of the old Law, and of Baptisme.

(k) *A Testament left therby.*] That the Eucharist conteyneth in it selfe a Testament, appeareth out of those words of *Luke* 22. *Hic est Calix nouum Testamentum in meo Sanguine*. But nothing is accustomed to be expressed in more plaine, and litterall words, then a *VVill* or *Testament*, that thereby may be preuented all occasion of contention, as touching the Will of the Testator. And this appeareth by the example of the old Testament, which being instituted in *Exod.* 24. is there explicated in most proper, and familiar words. The like course we see performed in the making of the Testaments of men.

(l) *A Precept, or Law.*] That there is a *Diuine Precept* in the Institution of the Eucharist, appeareth out of those words, *Accipite, Edite, hoc facite*. But the words of Lawes, and Precepts ought to be most perspicuous, and cleere, since otherwise occasion of erring would presently arise: Hence is it, that not only the *Decalogo*, but also other Passages of the old Law, wherein certaine rites are ordained, are set downe in very plaine, and proper words. In like sort we say, that seing the Institution of the Eucharist conteyneth in it selfe (in the iudgements of all) one of the chiefest dogmaticall points of Christian Religion, it therefore ought to be deliuered without any Tropes, or Figures: for we find that all such principle Articles of Religion, and Faith are deliuered in Scripture in a most facile, and easy phrase of speach.

(m) Τὸ ποτήριον &c.] This point is explicated aboue at the letter (h) in the explication of the Pronowne HOC.

(n) *Surrep-*

(n) *Surreptitious*.] So saith *Beza*, as not being able to answere to the argument of the Catholikes, drawne from the Greeke Text.

(o) *Calix Benedictionis*.] 1. *Cor*. c. 10. In English thus: *The Chalice of benediction, which we do blesse, is it not the communication of the Blood of Christ? And the Bread, which we breake, is it not the participation of the Body of Christ?* Now this place affoards diuers Arguments in proofe of our Catholike doctrine. And First from those first words, *Calix benedictionis, cui benedicimus*. Out of which words we deduce, that *Consecration* is necessary to the Sacrament of the Eucharist; but it were not necessary, if the *Eucharist* were but only a Figure of our Sauiours Body, since for the effecting of thus much, the first institution of Christ, and his will manifested in the Holy Scriptures were sufficient: for the *Paschall Lambe*, and *Manna* were figures of Christs Body, & Sacraments (according to our Aduersaries doctrine) and yet there was not required any consecration for the making of those figures. In like sort we find, that no Consecration is vsed to the water of Baptisme, to make it thereby a Sacrament.

Another Argument may be taken from the words, *Panis, quem frangimus*. In which place the word *Fractio*, is as much as *Immolatio*, or *Oblatio*, according to that of the Apostle 1. *Cor*. 11. *Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis frangitur*: For all these are the words of the same Apostle in the same Epistle, and intreating of the same matter. Besides the Apostle heere describeth the Cup, not by words of distribution, but of Consecration: Therefore it is most probable, that he did in like sort describe the Bread by way of Consecration, not of distribution: Now then, if in this place *Frangere*, doth signify *Immolare*, to immolate, or offer vp in Sacrifice; then it ineuitably followeth, that the word *Panis*, doth not here signify naturall wheaten bread, but the very Body of Christ, which is supersubstantiall, & celestiall Bread: for no man will say, that we doe immolate, and offer vp to God plaine naturall Bread.

(p) *Quimanducat*.] 1. Cor. 11. *He that eateth, and drinketh vnworthily, eateth, and drinketh iudgement to himselfe, not discerning the Body of our Lord*.]

Now out of this Text, thus we argue: Heere certaine are reprehended for the receauing of the body of Christ vnworthily, and of such it is said, that they eate, and drinke iudgement, and not life to themselues. But of these it cannot be said, that they receaue the body of Christ in spirit, and Faith (because in so doing they should receaue it profitably) therefore they receaue it in Body alone, and consequently the Body of Christ is really, and truly in the Eucharist, since the Body

of Christ, as it is in heauen, cannot be taken with our bodily mouth.

It cannot be replyed heerto (as some of our Aduersaries haue written) that such persons are said by the Apostle to eate iudgement to themselues, because they do not receaue truely the Body of Christ, which God doth offer to them in those signes, which is as much, as if they should cast it vpon the ground, and betrample it. This refuge auayleth nothing, the reason therof being, in that the Apostle in this place saith not, that such offend in not receauing, but in receauing vnworthily; so as their sinne consisteth in the taking of it, not in the omission therof, and not taking.

Neither will that other answere of *Caluin, lib. 4. Instit. c. 17. §. 33.* & of *Peter Martyr in comment. huius loci*, aduantage them any thing at all, who teach: That the meaning of the Apostle in this former place is, that the wicked are said to eate, & drinke to their owne damnation, in that by taking of the Eucharist, they wrong the *Symboles*, or Signes of Christs Body: Now (say they) the iniury offered to a Signe, or Image, redoundeth to that of which it is a Signe, or Image. This answere ouerthroweth themselues, in that it inforceth them to acknowledge, that they wrong the Catholikes, against whom they at other times inueigh so much (euen charging them with idolatry therin) for giuing a certaine honour to the Images of Christ, & the Saints, and teaching that the reuerence giuen to them is transferred from the to Christ, and his Saints. As in like sort, the wrong, or iniury done to the Images (in which point the Sectaries of this Age do exceed) resulteth to Christ, and his Saints. Againe, if this were the only reason of S. *Paules* words, then he which receaueth the Eucharist in mortall sinne (so that he come not with an intention of violating, or dishonouring the *Symboles* of Christs Body) should not be guilty of Christs Body, nor eate Iudgment to himselfe, and yet in so doing, he is most guilty therof. The reason of this Inference is, in that, if an Image be destroyed, or defaced by any meanes, so that it be not done with an intention of dishonouring the Saint (wherof it is an Image) there is no offence committed against the Saint. Lastly, by force of this Answere, it should not be lawfull for a sinner, to looke vpō the picture of Christ, nor to heare the word of God, since both these do represent, and offer Christ vnto vs. Hence then we may conclude, that it was not the Apostles meaning, that therfore they did sinne, who did receaue the Eucharist vnworthily, because it doth represent Christ.

(q) *Diuers examples.*] Many examples of this kind are alledged by the Sacramentaries; as *Agnus est Pascha*, id est *Transitus*, Exod. 12. *Petra erat Christus*, 1. Cor. 10. *Baptismus est lauacrum regenerationis*, Tit. 3. *Septem boues sunt septem anni*, Gen. 14. *Ego sum ostium*,

ostium, Ioan. 10. and diuers other such like.

To these I answere, First, that most of these places are falsly expounded. And, first as touching that, *Petra erat Christus*, These words (according to the exposition of *Ambros.*, *Chrysostome*, and others vpon this place) are not to be vnderstood of the materiall Rock, which signified Christ, for that followed not the Iewes, but of the spirituall and inuisible Rock, which prouided all necessary things for the Iewes, which Rock was properly, and truly Christ as God. Now, though the Trope be, that Christ is there called the Rock, yet by the addition of the word *Spiritualis*, the Trope is explained, and therefore this Proposition, *Spiritualis petra erat Christus*, is taken properly and not figuratiuely.

To that other, *Baptismus est lauacrum regenerationis*, I say, that Baptisme doth not signify only here the Lauacre of Regeneration, but it truly washeth the soule of Man from sinne, if the effect be not hindered by our indisposition.

To that, *Agnus est Pascha*, we reply, that *Agnus Paschalis*, the Paschall Lambe is not heere Tropically called the *Pascha*, because it signified *Transitum*, but it was called the *Pascha* properly, no otherwise then as the Festiuall Day was called *Pascha*, from the word deriued *à Transitu Domini*, because the Lamb was then sacrificed, and that Day was made Festiuall in remembrance of that *Transitus*, or Passouer.

To that, *Septem boues sunt septem anni*, we say it is a Parable, and in such Parables, Similitudes, and Visions, the verbe *Est* is taken for *significat*, and yet without any Trope: the reason heereof being, because (as is aboue touched) the whole essence of all such things is placed in signification; And therefore the sense of these words is not, that the seauen Oxen did signifie the seauen yeares, but that the Oxen appeared in vision to signify those yeares.

Secondly we answere, that in all examples alledged by our Aduersaries, there immediately followeth an explication of the Trope, or Figure: but of the words of the Institution there followeth no explication.

Thirdly, in most of the examples alledged by our Aduersaries (for there are diuers others produced by them) *fit praedicatum dispar subiecto*, that is, that which is of a most different nature is said of another thing of a like different nature, as in this, *Boues sunt Anni*, *Christus est Ostium* &c. for seeing that in these, and such like, the Propositions cannot be by any meanes properly, and literally true, we are forced to expound the same by Tropes, and Figures: But in these words, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, there is no such kind

strange and vnnaturall predication, at least in the appearance of the words themselues.

Lastly, if we should admit that in the examples produced, *Est* is taken for *Significat*, yet seing this verbe is more often taken in it owne naturall signification, then otherwise, it followeth, that it should be so taken in the words of the Institution, rather then without sufficient reason to the contrary, to be expounded figuratiuely.

(r) *In Remembrance of Christ.*] *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem: Doe this in Remembrance of mee.*] From hence it followeth not, that because we are commaunded to celebrate the Eucharist in remembrance of Christ, that therefore Christs Body is not there really present. For the meaning of these words is set downe by Saint Paul 1. Cor. 11. saying, *Mortem Domini annunciabitis donec veniat: you shall shew the death of our Lord, vntill he shall come.*] Therefore we are commanded to take the Eucharist in remembrance of our Lords death, and Passion, which is not present, but absent, or rather it is not, but was.

(s) *Not leaue Heauen.*] Act. 3. *Oportet illum Cælum suscipere vsq; ad tempus restitutionis omnium. VVhom* (meaning Christ) *Heauen must receaue, vntill the tyme of therestitution of all things.*] It followeth not from hence, that Christ neuer leaueth Heauen: *Ergo* his Body is not in the Eucharist; for we teach, that Christ ought not to leaue Heauen, or to descend with a Locall Motion, when he is in the Eucharist, for heere no question is made of the Article of Ascension, but rather of Christs Omnipotency: to wit, whether Christ by his Diuine Power may place himselfe in seuerall places at one Tyme; of which Point it is sufficiently treated aboue in the first Part of this Treatise.

(t) *Haue is touched.*] *Palpate, & videte, quia Spiritus carnem, & ossa non habent, sicut me videtis habere. Handle, and feele, for a Spirit hath not flesh, and bones, as you see mee to haue.* Luc. 24.] To argue thus: *It is felt, and seene,* Ergo, *it is a body*, is a good consequence: and this is the force of our Sauiours words. But it is no good sequele to argue thus negatiuely (as our Aduersaries heere doe.) *It is not felt, nor seene,* Ergo *it is not a Body*: for it may be, that a true body may be present, and yet neither seene, nor felt, either in that it is couered with a new Body (or else because God may hinder, that it shall not transmit any *sensiles species* to the sense of sight. Besides it may be effected by diuine power, that a Body may exist indiuisibly after the manner of a spirit, and yet it is impossible, that a spirit should exist diuisibly after the manner of a true, and naturall Body. But of this point also I haue discussed in the former part hereof.

(u) It

(u) *Is called Bread.*] The Eucharist is called indeed *Bread* in the two former texts of the first to the Corinthians; yet it followeth not, that therefore Christs Body is not in the *Eucharist*; for it may be called Bread, in that, in the Hebrew Phrase vnder the name of Bread is vnderstood all kind of meate.

Againe, it may be so called, in that the Scripture is often accustomed to call things, as outwardly they appeare; so it calleth the Brasen Serpent, a Serpent; Angells appearing in Mens shape, Men; the brazen Oxen of the Temple, Oxen &c. Therefore in that the Eucharist externally differeth nothing from Bread, no meruayle if it be so tearmed.

Thirdly the Eucharist may be called Bread, because it is made of Bread, or because it was Bread before. Thus we find, that Matth. 11. the blind are said to see, and Exodus 7. the wands changed into Dragons, were notwithstanding after called wands; And Genes. 3. Eue is called the Bone of Adam.

(x) *The same spirituall meate.*] 1. Cor. 10. *Patres nostri eamdem escam spiritualem manducauerunt, & eumdem potum spiritualem biberunt. All our Fathers did eate the same spirituall foode, and did drinke the same spirituall drinke.*] This place prooueth not, that the Iewes did eate the same spirituall meate, which we Christians doe eate (which point is to be proued, or else these words make nothing against the Reall Presence) but it only euinceth, that all those Iewes, which then did liue (as well the wicked, as the vertuous) did eate the same spirituall meate; And therefore S. Augustine to distinguish the spirituall meate of vs Christians from that of the Iewes, thus saith: *Aliud est Pascha, quod Iudæi de oue celebrant, aliud quod nos in corpore, & sanguine Domini accipimus.*

(y) *Entreth in at the Mouth.*] Matth. 15. *Omne quod intrat in os, in ventrem vadit, & in secessum emittitur.*] Heere our Sauioure speaketh only of meates, which are taken for the nourishment of the body, for such meates doe hold their ordinary course; wherefore when after his resurrection he did truly eate, and drinke, yet seing he did it not to the end of nourishing his Body, therefore that meate, and drinke so taken by him, had not the ordinary passage with other meates described by our Sauiour. In like sort, the Body of Christ, which is taken by the faithfull not to nourish their bodyes, but their soules, is not corporally disgested, nor hath the common passage with other meates.

(z) *The Spirit which quickeneth.*] Iohn 6. *Spiritus est, qui viuificat, caro non prodest. It is the spirit which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.*] From which place our Aduersaries do gather,

that seeing the flesh profiteth nothing, that therfore Christs flesh is not truly in the Eucharist: which Inference is false; for heere the litterall sense of these words is not, that the flesh of Christ doth not profit, but that a carnall vnderstanding of spirituall things doth not profit, and so is this place explicated by *Cyprian* Serm. de cæna Domini, *Origen*, lib. 3. in epistola ad Romanos, *Chrysostome* vpon this place, and by diuers others. Now this construction heerof is proued, because almost in euery place in the Scriptures, the flesh is distinguished against the spirits as we find in *Gen. 6. Matth. 16. Rom. 8. Gal. 5.* and in diuers other places: Therfore our Sauiours meaning in the former wordes is, that to thinke, that the flesh of Christ is to be eaten after a carnall manner, as other meates are, to wit, to be cut in pieces, to be boyled, to be conuerted into our proper substance by force of the naturall heat (in which sense the *Capharnaites* did afore think our Lord to haue spoken) that thus carnally to imagine, profiteth nothing; and therfore our Lord immediately subioyneth, *Verba, quæ ego locutus sum vobis, spiritus & vita sunt*, that is, they are words explicating diuine, & spirituall things, and such as bring eternall life, and therfore they are not to be vnderstood after a humane, and carnall sense.

But let vs suppose, that Christ spake of his flesh, yet it proueth nothing against his being in the Eucharist, both because by the same reason, we may conclude, that the bread is not in the Sacrament; for if the body of Christ profiteth vs nothing, much lesse will a little peece of wheaten bread profit vs: Againe, if our Lord had spoken of his flesh, he would not haue vnderstood it absolutely, but only that the flesh without the spirit profiteth nothing; since otherwise our Lord should haue crossed himselfe, who saith euen in the said Chapter, *Qui manducat carnem meam, habet vitam æternam.*] Lastly, it is no lesse then a great impiety to deny, that the flesh of Christ (being vnited with his Diuinity) profiteth vs nothing, seeing that *S. Paul. Coloss. 1.* attributes all our saluation to the flesh of Christ, since he saith, that we are reconciled to God by the said flesh.

(a) *In sua fortitudine confusi.*] Ezech. 16.

(b) *Scriptura non potest solui.*] Iohn 2.

(c) *Mirabilia testimonia tua.*] Psal. 120.

(d) *Possessed persons*] *In vita S. Bernard. l. 2. c. 3.* Where it is recorded, that a woman being a long time most dangerously possessed with a Diuell, *S. Bernard* bringing the *Blessed Sacrament*, and houlding it ouer the head the of possessed person, dispossessed the Diuell.

(e) *Humane shape.*] *Paschasius*, lib. *de Corpore Domini. c.* 14. mentioneth, that a certaine godly Priest prayed deuoutly vnto God

God, that he would vouchsafe to let him see that Body, which he verily believed did lye vnder the formes of Bread, and Wine, who at the length obteyned his desire, and saw the Body of our Sauiour in the shape of a yong child.

(f) *Punished by God.*] *S. Bernard* in the life of *S. Malachias* reporteth, that a Clergy-man denying the Body of Christ to be really in the Sacrament, was oftentimes admonished by *Malachias*, but he not acknowledging his Heresie, *Malachias* prayed to God in these words: *Dominus faciat te veritatem confiteri, vel ex necessitate.*] to which words the Heretike said *Amen*. Wherupon presently he was taken with a mortall disease, acknowledged his Heresie, was reconciled to the Church, and instantly after dyed.

In like sort *Tilmannus Bredenbachius*, *l. 6. Sacrarum collationū. c. 60.* reporteth, that in a Citty of *Geldria Anno 1561. die 8. Aprilis*, the Parish Priest of the Towne did carry (after the custome of Catholikes) the Blessed Sacrament to a sick woman, and passing through a streete, where two yong youths were wagering, whether of them could sooner swallow downe their Easter Egge, the one of them being an Heretike, said, that he could sooner swallow downe his egge, then the Woman could swallow her God; wherupon he putting the Egge into his mouth, the Egge did sticke in the middest of his throat, and he perceauing the same, did take a white candle (which was neere to him) and with it endeauoured to thrust the Egge downe, but he fainting, instantly dyed, his face growing most black, and vgly to behould: And after he being opened, the Egge was found not in the throate, but in the other part called *aspera Arteria*, or Windpipe.

(g) *Bruite Beastes.*] *Antoninus in summa historiali*, part. 3. titul. 24. c. 3. relateth, that *S. Antony* disputing with a certaine Heretike (who denyed the Reall Presence) in the Countrey of *Tolosa*, the Heretike demaunded, that the truth therof might be confirmed by *S. Antony*, by some Miracle, and said, that he without some such proofe would not beleiue the Reall Presence. It was concluded betweene thē, that the Heretike hauing an Oxe, or some such beast, he should forbeare to giue him any meate at all for the space of three dayes, and then after *S. Antony* should bring the Blessed Sacrament where the Beast was, and the Heretike should set before him some corne, if then the Beast should not touch the corne, but prostrate himselfe (in such sort as he could) before the Blessed Sacrament, that then the Heretike would be content to beleiue the Catholike doctrine therin; All which being thus far prepared in the presence of infinite people, *S. Antony* houlding the Eucharist in his hands, spake to the

Beast certaine words, whereupon the Beast hauing Corne before him, did eate no part thereof, but with bowing downe his head, and body, did prostrate himselfe before the Blessed Sacrament to the great wonder, and confirmation of the faithfull.

Another Example heere happened in our Coūtry in the Church of S. *Paul* in London, as *VValdensis* reporteth (who was there present) *tom.* 2. *c.* 63. A certaine Mechanicall fellow, not belieuing the Reall Presence, was conuented in the Church before the Arch-Bishop; and obstinately answered the Bishop, that he would rather worship a spider, then the Eucharist; at the speaking wherof, instantly there came downe a huge Spyder by his threed, or Web from the top of the Church, hastning to enter into the Heretickes mouth, which was preuented, but by much difficulty of the standers by.

(h) *Glorificabit me bestia Agri.*] Esay 43.

(i) *Doting credulity.*] So doe most of the Sacramentaries answere, as thinking all such reportes to be meere fictions.

(k) *Sleights of the Diuell.*] So answereth *Peter Martyr* to these Miracles *lib. contra Gardinerum*, confirming this his answere from the Examples of *Marcus*, and *Magus*, who both being Arch-heretickes wrought appearing Miracles by the power of the Diuell. But I would demand of Martyr, what comparison is there betweene those Hereticks, and these other holy Men? Againe, I say, that this his Answere cannot be applied to those Miracles heere alledged, which consist in the death of Men, for their deaths were true deaths, and not counterfaite, or forged.

(l) *VVhen first it beganne.*] I know well that most of the vulgar Sacramentaries diuulge in their writings, that the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* first came in, in the *Lateran Councell* holden vnder *Innocentius* the 3. yea *Doctor VVhitaker* himselfe is not ashamed to teach so much *lib.* 7. *contra Duraum.* pag. 480. The falshood of which common error is by seuerall meanes discouered.

First, because that Councell was gathered chiefely to condemne the contrary doctrine of *Berengarius*, then first broaching this Heresy: so as this Councell did then suppresse, and disallow all innouation of doctrine; which very point is acknowledged by *Fox* himselfe, *Acts*, and *Monum.* pag. 1121. who thus there writeth: *About the yeare of our Lord 1060. the denying of Transubstantiation began to be accounted Heresy, and in that number was first Berengarius, who liued about Ann. Dom. 1060.*

Secondly, It is most improbable, that a Councell gathered out of all the most distant Nations of Christendome, should vpon a present so conspiringly imbrace an innouation of doctrine so contrary to Sense,

Sense, as the Catholike doctrine herein is.

Thirdly, and Lastly, The Protestants themselues doe acquite this Councell from bringing in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, since they doe charge diuers Fathers therewith, lyuing long before this Councell of Lateran. As for Example (to omit those confessions of the Protestants, which hereafter vpon another occasion shall be alledged) we find, that *Doctor Humfrey in Iesuitism. part. 2. rat. 5.* thus writeth: *In Ecclesiam quid inuexerunt Gregorius, & Augustinus? Intulerunt onus ceremoniarum &c. Transubstantiationem &c.*] In like sort we find, that *Vrsinus Commonefact. cuiusdam Theologi de Sacra Domini Cœna, pag. 211.* reprehendeth *Theophylact*, and *Damascene* for the doctrine of Transubstantiation in these words: *Theophylactus, & Damascenus plane inclinant ad Transubstantiationem.*] Yea *Damascene* was so full in this doctrine, that he is charged therewith by diuers other Protestants, to wit, *Doctor Fulke against Heskins pag. 217. & 204. Oecolampadius l. epist. Oecolampad. & Zuing. l. 3. pag. 661.* so true is that confession of *Antony de Adamo* (a famous Protestant) who thus writeth hereof in his *Anatomie of the Masse*, pag. 238. *I haue not hitherto beene able to know, when this opinion of the Reall, and bodily being of Christ in the Eucharist did first beginne.*] And thus far of this point: where only it can be obiected, that as the former Councell inuented only the word *Transubstantiation*, but not the doctrine; so the Councell of *Nice* inuented the word ὁμοούσιος, though the doctrine thereof were afore.

(m) *Berengarius Archdeacon.*] This appeareth out of *Paschas. lib. de verbis Instit. Sacramenti.*

(n) *Contradiction, and Oppositon.*] For he was written against by *Lanfrancus*, *Guitmundus*, and *Algerus*.

(o) *Tenseuerall Councells.*] To wit, *in Concilio Romano, Vercellensi, Turonensi, Romano* vnder *Nicolas* the 2. *Romano* vnder *Gregorie* the seauenth, *Romano* vnder *Innocentius* the 3. *Viennensi, Romano* vnder *Iohn* the thirteenth, *Constantinensi, Tridentino*.

(p) *Neuer heard of.*] For though *Ignatius in epist. ad Smyrnenses* maketh mention of some, who denyed the Reall Presence in the Eucharist; yet those Heretickes were not properly, and formally Heretickes in this point, but chiefely in the Article of the Incarnation: for seeing they denyed, that our Sauiour tooke vpon him true flesh, they consequently, and by way of inference only, denyed that his flesh was in the Eucharist.

(q) *Great confidence &c.*] Answerably heerto did *M. Iewell* make his acclamation at *Paules* Crosse. *O Gregory, O Austen, O Hierome &c. If we be deceiued, you haue deceaued vs: this you taught vs.* And then further saith in the said Sermon. *As I said before, so I say againe, I*

am content to yield and subscribe, if any of our learned Aduersaries, or if all the learned Men that be alyue, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholike Doctour, or Father, or out of any old Generall Councell, or for the space of six hundred yeares after Christ. Which generall Challenge *M. Iewell* did make concerning 27 seuerall Articles of faith. And which Challenge was afterward iterated by *D. VVhitaker in respons. ad rationes Campiani rat. 5.* in these words: *Audi Campiane, quamea die Iuellus vocem verissimam ac constantissimam emisit, quando ad sexcentorum annorum antiquitatem prouocauit, vobisq; obtulit, vt si vel vnicam ex aliquo Patre, aut Concilio, claram & dilucidam sententiam afferetis, non recusaret, quin vobis palmam concederet: ea est nostrum omnium Professio; idem omnes pollicimur, fidem non fallemus.* In like sort *M. VVillet* in his *Antilog. pag. 269.* writeth: *I take God to witnes, before whom I must render account &c. that the same faith and Religion, which I defend, is taught and confirmed in the more substantiall Points by those Histories, Councells, Fathers, that liued within fiue or six hundred yeares after Christ.* Finally, *M. Sutcliffe* in his Examination of Doctor Kellisons *Suruey* saith: *The Fathers in all points are for vs, and not for the Pope.*

(r) *Interroga de diebus.*] Deuteron. 4.

THAT

THAT THE ANCIENT FATHERS taught the Reall Presence.

AND

First of such their Testimonies, as concerne their Appellation, and Naming of the Eucharist.

CHAP. II.

SVCH was the confidence of (a) *Samuel* in God, that after he had annointed *Saul* King of *Israel*, he was content, that *Saul* for the time should relinquish all former right obtained by lawfull Inauguration, and should adventure his regayning therof by triall of Lots, not doubting, but that God would infallibly temper, and dispose the Lots for *Saules* aduantage.

And

And such is the assurance, which we now shew herein: For wheras we haue already drawne our chiefest forces from the holy Scriptures, and other most conuincing proofes, for the aduancing, & warranting of our Catholike faith in this weighty Controuersy; Neuertheless (as prouoked thereunto through the circular tergiuersation of our Aduersaryes) we are pleased (for the present) as supposing our selues to be disimpatronized of our best Forts, to suffer the matter to be definitiuely decided by the voices, and suffrages of the ancient Fathers, as by so many Lotts; being acertained, that God hath altogeather directed their pennes (through a prenotion, and foreknowledge of these lamentable times) for the iustifying, and maintaining of this our doctrine; for (b) *Dominus Deus aspiciet veritatem*.

This proofe made by the Fathers, we cannot but willingly imbrace, in that we doe acknowledge them to haue beene most shining Lamps in the Church of God; and therefore we will heere vse the light of their Testimonyes, as a meanes to find out the light of the Truth, imitating therin the three *Magi*, of whom the Church saith: *Lumen requirunt lumine*, since a Starre did guide them to their Sunne.

And heere (for the greater satisfaction of our Aduersaries) I will restraine my selfe to those Fathers, which liued within the first fiue hundred yeares, both because they doe but scorne with an vnaccustomed insolency (the very eye, and countenance of Heresy) all Doctors of later tymes; as also in that they set downe the Circle of these Ages, as the *Horizon*, which terminates, and ends our sight betweene the first supposed light of their Ghospell, and the *Babylonian*, and *Cymerian* darkenesse (to

speake

speake in their language) of Romish superstition.

But heare it will not be amisse to instruct the Reader aforehand, in what Age or Century euery Father (whose Authority shall heerafter be alledged) did liue, that thereby he may know how neere or remote in tyme euery one of them was to our Sauiour, and his Apostles.

In the fifth age or hundred yeares from Christ, did liue *Gaudentius*, *Chrysostome*, *Hierome*, *Augustine*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *Porclus Constantinopolitanus*, *Theodoret*, *Gelasius*, *Leo*, *Hilarius* Pope, *Eusebius Emyssenus*.

In the fourth Century, the first Councell of *Nyce* was celebrated; in the same age liued *Athanasius*, *Hilarius*, *Cyryl* of *Ierusalem*, *Ambrose*, *Basil*, *Optatus*, *Gregorius Nyssenus*, and *Nazianzenus*, *Ephrem*, *Epiphanius*.

In the third Age, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*.

In the second, *Iustinus Martyr*, *Pius* Pope, *Irenaus*.

In the first, euen in the tyme and dayes of the Apostles, the disciples of S. *Andrew*, *Ignatius*, *Dionysius Areopagita*: where we are to remember, that a Father (as for example *Iustinus Martyr*) may be said to liue in the second age, and yet to haue beene but a hundred and some very few yeares distant from *Christ*; And the like proportionably may be said of diuers Fathers of the other succeeding Ages.

With these then (and no others) at this tyme will I hold intelligence, whose Iudgements, and sentences (as so many pointed weapons) shall euery way endanger our Sacramentary; since the admitting of their Authorities proclaymes his certaine Ouerthrow; the reiecting, his most dishonorable retyring, and giuing backe.

Now, in the handling of this point for the more perspicuitie, and clearnesse, I will reduce such testimonies

of the Fathers, as I intend to alledge, to certaine principall Heads.

The first whereof shall be taken from the different appellations of this great Mysterie, giuen by the Protestants, and by the Fathers: where we are to remember, that since Mans immanent Thought (which is an inward progression of the Mind) is best become *Transient*, or externally manifested by the Mediation of wordes; Therfore *Nature* (Gods obsequious Agent) hath imparted to him the vse of *Speach*, which Speach ought among men to be a true & sincere Interpreter of the Soules mentall Language, for we find those to haue bene greatly reprehended, *Qui* (c) *linguis suis dolosè agebant*. Hence is it, that as long as Man conformes himselfe to Gods intended vse herein, his conceipt, iudgment, & opinion had of any thing, is best discouered by his words deliuered vpon the same.

Now then let vs see, how the Fathers in words entitle this Sacrament. First we find, that they call it, the *Body, and Bloud of Christ*; againe they further proceed, and call it, *The precious Body of Christ*, *Mans Price*, *The pledge of Mans health*, *The most dreadfull Mysteries*, and the like. But what? Is this the Dialect of our Aduersaries? Or, are they accustomed to speake in this manner of language? No. For when they speake of the Eucharist, their naturall and mother tongue, is to tearme it only the Symboles, and signes of the Body and Bloud of Christ, (d) *Quantum distat ortus ab occasu*? If then our Aduersaries can in no case brooke to speake hereof, as the Fathers did, how can it probably be presumed, that they beleiued therin, as the Fathers did? Since words are the true Counterpane of the Mind, written with the pen of

it

itowne Tongue.

But now to come to theſe Teſtimonies, wherin the Euchariſt is thus termed, and to beginne with the latter part of the fifth Age, that ſo aſcending vp by degrees to higher tymes, we may conſequently aſcend in force, & weight of Argument, drawn from ſuch their Authorities. And heere becauſe many teſtimonies wil occur far more pregnant, & cleare for vs Catholikes, then the Proteſtãt Reader (not conuerſant in the Fathers works) will perhaps expect, and therupon might coniecture ſome ſleight, & impoſture to be vſed in the Engliſhing of them, I haue therfore thought good to ſet downe in euery paſſage, & head of their authorities, ſix teſtimonies ech of them at large in Latin of ſeuerall Fathers (for to obſerue this Method all were needleſſe, as tending only to fill vp paper.) The places that in this ſort I make choice of, are ſuch, as ſeeme more conuincing, & euident then the reſt, ſo that if the Reader do ſee, that the more forcible authorities are free from all ſuſpected corruption in the tranſlating of them, he may the more probably aſſure himſelfe, that the reſt are in no ſort wreſted from their true, and naturall meaning: for who in this ſort corrupteth, is preſumed to vſe his art in thoſe paſſages, as make moſt for his aduãtage. Thus ſhal the Reader diſcerne the Catholiks integritie, candor, & confidence in this weighty Controuerſie.

Firſt then occurreth *S. Leo*, who thus writeth *Serm. 6. de Ieiunio ſeptimi menſis. Sic ſacramenſæ communicare debetis, vt nihil prorſus de veritate Corporis Chriſti, & Sanguinis ambigatis. Hoc enim ore ſumitur, quod fide creditur, & fruſtra ab illis, Amen, reſpondetur, à quibus contra id quod accipitur, diſputatur.*] *So you ought to communicate of the holy Table, as that you doubt not at all of the Body &*

Bloud of Christ. For this is taken by the mouth, which is beleeued by faith, and in vaine they do answere, Amen, *who dispute against that which is taken.*]

S. Cyril Bishop of *Alexandria*, who was President of the Generall Councell of *Ephesus*, against *Nestorius* the Heretike, *epist. ad Nestorium* saith: *Sic etiam ad mysticas benedictiones &c. Thus do we come to the mysticall blessings, and are sanctified, being made partakers of the holy Body, and precious Bloud of Christ, who is the Redeemer of vs all; we take it not, as common flesh (God forbid) nor as the flesh of a man sanctified, but the proper flesh of the Word himself.*] Which testimony was approued by the Generall *Ephesine* Coūcell.

S. *Augustine* expounding those words of the Psalme 21. *Manducauerunt, & adorauerant omnes diuites plebis*, in epist. 120. c. 17. *ad Honoratum*, thus writeth: *Et ipsi adducti sunt &c. And they are brought to the Table of Christ, and they take of his body, and bloud; they worship only, but they are not fed therewith, because they doe not imitate: for they eating him who is poore, do not brooke, that themselues should be poore.*] Heere for further explication we may adde, that proud and wicked men doe take from the Table of our Lord the body, and bloud of Christ, and that they doe adore it; from the which it followeth, that (according to *S. Augustines* Iudgement) by the body of our Lord, is not vnderstood the signe of the body, to wit, Bread, because Bread it not adored, neither is vnderstood the body of Christ, as it is in heauen, and not vpon the Altar, because *S. Augustine* saith, it is taken from the Table of our Lord, and by they wicked.

The same *S. Augustine* also in lib. 2. *contra Aduersarium Legis, & Prophetarum, c.* 9. thus writeth: *Mediatorē Dei & hominū, hominem Christum Iesum carnem suam nobis manducandam*

manducandam, bibendumq; sanguinem dantem fideli corde, atq; ore suscipimus: quamuis horribilius videatur humanam carnem manducare, quàm perimere, & humanum Sanguinem potare, quàm fundere. We take with a faithfull heart, and mouth the Mediator of God, and Man, to wit Iesus Christ being Man, who giues his flesh to vs to be eaten, and his bloud to be drunken; though it may seeme a more horrible matter to eate Mans flesh, then to destroy Mans flesh, and to drinke bloud, then to shed bloud.] Where he saith that Christs flesh is not taken only with the heart, but with the mouth: Againe it is not more horrible to eate Mans flesh, and drinke Mans bloud only in figure, & representation, then to kill a Man, or shed his bloud.

He also *lib. 9. Confess. c. 13.* speaking of his Mother saith: *Ad cuius pretij nostri &c. To the Sacrament of our pryce* (meaning the Eucharist) *thy handmayd did bind her soule with the band of faith.*]

Againe *Tomo nono tract. 11. in Ioan.* explicating that, *Iesus non se credebat ijs*, saith, this saying to agree with such as are *Catechumeni*, to whom our Lord gaue not his Body. Thus he saith: *Si dixerimus Catechumeno &c. If we say to one that is but Catechumenus, Doest thou beleiue in Christ? He answereth, I do beleiue, and he signeth himselfe with the signe of the Crosse of Christ, neither is he ashamed of the Crosse of his Lord; for behould he beleiueth in his name. But let vs demaund of him, Doest thou eate the flesh of the Sonne of Man, & drinke the bloud of the sonne of Man? He knoweth not what we say, for Christ herein hath not commended himselfe to him.*] But if the body of Christ be taken in the Eucharist, only in signe, and by faith, then *Saint Augustine* saith false, that Christ hath not committed himselfe to the *Catechumeni*, for they haue

Christ in signe, and they eate his body by faith, because they believe in Christ, and signe themselues with the signe of the Crosse. Besides, there were no reason, why the Eucharist should not be giuen to the *Catechumeni*, seeing that more cleere signes are giuen to them, to wit, the written, & preached word of God.

In the tenth Tome *serm. 2. de verbis Apostoli*, he calleth the Eucharist, *Precium nostrum*, in these words: *Audiuimus veracem Magistrum* &c. *We haue heard the true Maister, the diuine Redemptour, the Sauiour of Man, commending to vs his Bloud, which is our Price; for he did speake of his Body and Bloud, which Body he said to be Meate, and Bloud to be Drinke. Such as are Faithfull acknowledge the Sacramẽt of the faithfull.*] Heere he speaketh not of the figure of his Bloud, since the figure therof is not our Price. Neither can they say, that this meate, and drinke is taken only by faith, for he there adioyneth, that it is the Sacrament of the faithfull, which the faithfull only do know, intimating therby, that only the faithfull do vnderstand this Mysterie, how the Body and Bloud of Christ can be meate, and drinke.

Lastly, *in sermone ad Neophytos*, as *Paschasius* witnesseth *epist. ad Feudegardum* he saith: *Hoc accipite in pane, quod* &c. *Take that in the Bread, which did hang vpon the Crosse; take that in the Cup, which flowed from the side of Christ.*] But his Body did hang vpon the Crosse, and Bloud issued from his side.

S. Cyril of Ierusalem, Catechesi 4. Mystagogica, thus plainly writeth: *Hæc Beati Pauli doctrina satis potest efficere vos certissimos de diuinis Mysteriis. This doctrine of S. Paul is of force to make you assured of the diuine Mysteries.*] And after he saith: *Cum Christus ipse sic affirmat, atq; dicat de Pane,*

ne, Hoc est Corpus meum, *quis deinceps audeat dubitare? Ac eodem quoq; affirmante, ac dicente*, Hic est Sanguis meus, *quis, inquam, dubitet, ac dicat non esse illius Sanguinem?* Seeing that Christ himselfe affirmeth, and speaketh of Bread, *This is my Body*, who after this dare doubt therof? And he in like sort confirming, and saying, *This is my Bloud*, who is he (I say) that doubteth, and will say, it is not his Bloud?] So cleere is *S. Cyril* herein; his booke (from whence these places are drawne) being most certaine, and vndoubted of, and entreating of such things, and in such Method (to wit in a Catechisme) which require a most literall, and plaine explication.

S. Hilarius lib. 8. de Trinitate, de veritate Carnis &c. *There is no place left to doubt of the truth of* (Christs) *flesh, and Bloud; for now euen by the profession* (or speach) *of our Lord himselfe, and according to our beliefe, it is truly Flesh, and truly Bloud.*]

S. Cyprian, Serm. 5. *de Lapsis. Vis infertur* &c. *Violence is offered to Christs Body, and Bloud, and they now offend more against our Lord, with their hands and mouthes, then when they denyed our Lord.*] Hence *Cyprian* reprehendeth such as denying Christ afore, would receaue the Eucharist without any former due pennance. But it cānot be a greater sinne to handle with vnworthy hands a Signe or Figure of Christ then to deny Christ, therfore he there speaketh not of the signe, but of the true Body, and Bloud of Christ. He also *in Serm. de Cana Domini* (which booke though perhaps it was not written by *Cyprian*, yet our Aduersaries confesse, that it is written by a most ancient, and learned Father) thus saith: *Noua est huius Sacramenti* &c. *There is a new doctrine of this Sacrament, and the Euangelicall Schooles haue brought forth this*

first

first kind of learning, and this discipline first appeared to the world by Christ, the teacher therof. That Christians should drinke bloud, the eating wherof is most strictly forbidden by the authority of the Old Law. Thus the Law restrayneth altogether the eating of bloud, but the Ghospell commaundeth to drinke it.] But the old Law did not forbid the taking of bloud in figure; for the Iewes did drinke in figure the bloud of Christ, in drinking the water which flowed from the Rocke.

Origen homil. 5. *in diuersa loca Euangel.* where he entreateth of the Centurions child, thus sayth: *Quando sanctum cibum, illudq; incorruptum accipis epulum, quando vitæ pane, & poculo frueris, manducas, & bibis corpus, & sanguinem Domini, tunc Dominus sub tectum tuum ingreditur. Et tu ergo humilians temetipsum, imitare hunc Centurionem, & dicito: Domine non sum dignus, vt intres sub tectum meum. Qui enim indignè ingreditur, ibi ad iudicium ingreditur accipienti.* When thou takest the holy meate, and this incorruptible banquet, when thou enioyest the Cup, and Bread of Lyfe, thou eatest, and drinkest the Body, and Bloud of Christ; Then doth our Lord enter into thy house. Therefore thou humbling thy selfe, imitate this Centurion, and say: Lord I am not worthy, that thou shouldst enter into my house. For where he entreth vnworthily, there he entreth vnto the iudgement of the receauer.] Here cannot be vnderstood the Bread signifying Christs Body, because the Bread is not *Epulum incorruptum*, an incorruptible Meate, or Banquet; neither to the Bread can it be said: *O Lord I am not worthy* &c. Neither can heere be vnderstood the body of Christ, as it is eaten by Faith; because then it could not be said: *Where he entreth vnworthily, there he entreth vnto Iudge-*

ment

ment of the receauer. For our Aduersaries doe teach, that Christ is taken by faith of the godly only, and not of the wicked, and that the godly take it to saluation: and that which the wicked do take vnworthily, is only the externall signes.

Tertullian lib. de resurrect. Carn. Caro abluitur, vt anima emaculetur: Caro inungitur, vt anima consecretur: Caro corpore, & sanguine Christi vescitur, vt anima de Deo saginetur. The flesh is washed, that the soule may be made cleane, the flesh is annoynted, that the soule may be consecrated; the flesh feedeth of the body and bloud of Christ, that the soule may be nourished of God.] But the flesh is washed really, and truly with water, as also it is annoynted really, and truly with oyle; therfore it ought really, and truly to feed vpon the Body, and Bloud of Christ.

Ignatius, epist. ad Smyrnenses (as *Theodoret* citeth, *Dialog.* 3.) thus saith: *Eucharistias, & oblationes non admittunt, quòd non confiteantur Eucharistiam esse Carnem Saluatoris, quæ, pro peccatis nostris passa est, quam Pater sua benignitate suscitauit.* They do not admit (*to wit, certaine Heretickes denying that Christ had true Flesh*) the Eucharists, and Oblations, because they acknowledge not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Sauiour, which flesh suffered for our sinnes, the which the Father through his benignity raysed vp againe.] Heere *Ignatius* sayth not, that the Flesh of Christ is giuen to vs in some one manner, or other (as our Aduersaries would expound him) but he saith, that the Eucharist is the flesh of Christ. Heere also we are to note, that these Heretickes (against whom he heere speaketh) did refuse the Eucharist, least they should be inforced to confesse, that Christ had true flesh, if they did admit the Eucharist, which was the

Flesh of Christ. But if the Eucharist did only signify the flesh of Christ, they had no reason to deny the Eucharist, for they did not deny the Images, and Figures of Christ, but only his true Flesh; for such bodies as are only apparent, and not true bodyes, may be painted, or figured out in Images, as appeareth by the Images, and Pictures of Angells.

(a) *Confidence of Samuel.*] 1. Reg. c. 10.
(b) *Dominus Deus.*] 2. Machab. 7.
(c) *Qui linguis.*] Rom. 3.
(d) *Quantum distat.*] Psalm. 103.

THE

OF THE FATHERS AVTHORITIES.

touching the Change made in the Euchariſt.

CHAP. III.

A SECOND Branch of the Fathers Teſtimonies, may extend it ſelfe to the Change, which is made in the Sacrament of the Eucharift, which change, that it is reall, is neceſſarily included in their writings. For they teach, that after the Mutation is once made, the Bread remayneth not: and in further acknowledgment heerof they purpoſely do paralell it with other reall Mutations. As firſt with that of the Water turned by our Sauiour into Wine; But if an imminent Act of his will was of Power to turn water into wine, cannot a Tranſient operation of the ſaid will (breaking out into words of a poſitiue Aſſertiō) change wine into Bloud? Secondly, they compare the change

change heere with that of the Wands of *Moyses* turned into Serpents. But what proportion can there be, betweene these stupendious Mutations, and a little representatiue Bread, and Wine, still remayning Bread, and Wine? Therfore we may iustly say, that as those true Serpents (a) of *Moyses* did eate vp those counterfaite Serpents made in emulation therof by the false Prophets, euen so ought the reall Transelementation taught by the Fathers, exyle, and banish this but Sacramentall, and Sophisticated chang, brought in by the Sacramentaries.

They further teach, for the more facilitating of this great worke, that he, who could first giue the Essence and Forme to euery thing, could more easily superinduce a second forme. And therefore with good reason one of them saith, *Non* (b) *minus est nouas rebus dare, quàm mutare Naturas*. Since the first includeth an Absolute, and Primatiue Creation, the very Maister-peece of Gods *Omnipotency*, and such as Man cannot apprehend, but by apprehending, that *Nothing* is *Something*. The second implieth a former Existence of something, and consequently only a new kind of inuesting of it. Which later point (much more the First) the Fathers ascribe only to his power, who causing all changes, is yet himselfe vnchangeable, and producing all mutations, is immutable: *Ego* (c) *sum Dominus, & non mutor*.

Now then by reason of the true, and reall chang heere made, the Fathers doe further write, that our Sense (which in other things hath a great Soueraignty ouer our Iudgemẽt) is heere deceaued; for though the Eye would persuade vs, that there is Bread, and Wine in the Eucharist, yet they say plainly, that there is neither bread, nor wyne; thus teaching, that the vnderstanding heere corrects

rects the Eye in seeing, though only by the Eye it learnes, that there is any seeing; and affirming, that the vnderstanding (for Faith is an Act therof) which seeth not at all, heere only truly seeth. Thus if we believe those ancient Doctors, a Faith wrought out of sense only, is no better, then *Israel* (whereof the (d) Apostle speaketh) *according to the Flesh*.

But now to descend particulerly to their authorities sorting to the passages of this Chapter. First then *Eusebius Emissenus serm. de Corpore Dom.* sayth: *Inuisibilis Sacerdos* &c. *The inuisible Priest doth change through a secret power of his word the visible Creatures into the substance of his body and bloud.*] And againe he saith more plainly: *Quando benedicenda* &c. *When the Creatures (which are to be blessed) are placed vpon the Altars, before they be consecrated with the inuocation of the highest Power, they are the substance of Bread, and wine; but after the words of Christ, they are the body, and bloud of Christ. What meruayle, if those things, which he could create by his word, he can chang being already created?*

Proclus Bishop of *Constantinople lib. de Trad. diuinæ Liturgiæ. Per quas preces Spiritus sancti aduentum expectabant, vt eius diuina præsentia propositum in Sacrificio panem, & vinum aqua permixtum, ipsum illud corpus, & sanguinem Saluatoris nostri Iesu Christi efficeret.* By the force of these prayers (*meaning the words of the Institution*) we expect the comming of the Holy Ghost, that so, his diuine presence might make the bread, and wine mingled with water, the very Body, and Bloud of Iesus Christ our Sauiour.

Augustine serm. quem citat Beda in c. 10. prioris ad Cor. Non omnis panis &c. *Not euery bread, but that receauing*

the benedictiō of Christ, fit Corpus Christi, *is made the Body of Christ*, where the word (*fit*) includeth heere a true change at least against the Lutherans.

Chrysostome homil. 83. in Matth. *Non sunt humana* &c. *The words heere performed, are not in the power of Man; we only hould the place of Ministers, but it is he that sanctifieth, and changeth the things.*] And then after: *Qui dixit* &c. *He who said*, This is my Body, *confirmed the fact with his word.*] And *homil. de Eucharist. in Encæniis. Num vides panem? num vinum? num sicut reliqui cibi in secessum vadunt? Absit, ne sic cogites. Quemadmodum enim si cera igni adhibita illi assimilatur, nihil substantiæ remanet, nihil superfluit; sic & hic puta, mysteria consumi corporis substantia.* Doest thou see Bread? Doest thou see Wine? Do these things passe into the Common passage, as other meates do? Let it be farre from thee to thinke so. For euen as wax (laid neere to the fire) doth assimilate it selfe to it, nothing of the substance therof remayning, or superfluously redoūding; *So maist thou suppose the Mysteries heere to be consumed by the substance of the body.*

Gaudentius, tract. 2. de Exod. *Ipse Naturarum Creator, & Dominus, qui producit de terra panem, de pane rursus (quia & potest, & promisit) efficit proprium Corpus: & qui de aqua vinum fecit, & de vino Sanguinem suum.* He who is the Creatour, and Lord of all Natures, who bringeth forth Bread out of the earth, and againe who of the bread maketh his proper Body (for he is able, and he promised to do it) and who made wine of water, and of wine his owne Bloud.] And after againe: *O altitudo divitiarum &c.* O the depth of the riches of the wisdome, and knowledge of God! *Doe not thinke that terrestriall, which is made heauenly by him which passeth into it, and made it his*

owne Body and Bloud.] And finally, *Non infringamus os illud* &c. *Let vs not breake that most solide and firme bone*, This is my Body, This is my Bloud. *Now what remaynceth in the sense of any one, which he cannot conceaue by this exposition, let it be consumed, and burnt away with the ardour, & heate of faith.*

Epiphanius in Ancorato circa medium. *Videmus quod accepit Saluator* &c. *We do see, what our Sauiour tooke into his hands* (as the Euangelist noteth) *that he did rise from Supper, that he did take these things, and when he had giuen thankes, he said,* This is mine, *and* This, *and* This. *And we do see, that it is not equall, nor like to the proportion, or Image in flesh, to the inuisible Deity, to the lineaments of Mẽbers, for this is of a round forme, and insensible according to Power; And he would through grace say: Hoc meum est, Hoc, & Hoc; And yet euery one belieueth his speach, for who belieueth not to be his very true Body, doth fall from grace, and saluation.*] Now when he heere saith, that it is to be belieued, though it be repugnant to sense, this must needs be vnderstood of the Body it selfe, and not of the signification therof, since the sense rather helpeth, then hindreth, why we should belieue the Sacramẽt. And when he saith, that we ought to belieue, that it is *ipsum verum Corpus*, the true Body, hereby are excluded all Tropes, and Figures.

S. Gregory Nyssen, Orat. Catechetica c. 37. *Quamobrem rectè etiam nunc Dei verbo* &c. *Wherfore we now truly belieue euen by the word of God, that the sanctified Bread is changed into the Body of the word of God* &c. *That these things, which are seene (to wit bread, and wine) are changed into that Body of our Lord, is to be attributed to the vertue of Benediction.*

S. Ambrose l. 4. de Sacramentis. c. 4. *Tu fortè dicis, Panis*

Panis meus &c. *Perhaps thou sayest, My bread is vsuall bread; but this bread, is bread before the words of Consecration, but after Consecration is finished, of bread it is made the flesh of Christ.*] Though our Aduersaries doe answer this place, by reiecting this booke, as not written by *S. Ambrose*, yet is it cited vnder his name by *Lanfrancus*, *Guitmundus*, and others, who liued aboue fiue hundred yeares since. In like sort in his booke *de mysteriis init.* c. 9. he thus writeth: *Fortè dicas; Aliud video, quomodo tu mihi asseris, quòd Christi Corpus accipiam? Et hoc nobis adhuc superest vt probemus, quantis igitur vtimur exemplis, vt probemus non esse hoc, quod Natura formauit, sed quod Benedictio consecrauit? maioremq; vim esse benedictionis, quàm Naturæ, quia Benedictione etiam Natura ipsa mutatur? Virgam tenebat Moyses, proiecit eam, & facta est serpens &c. Quod si tantum valuit humana benedictio, vt naturam conuerteret, quid dicimus de ipsa consecratione diuina, vbi verba ipsa Domini Saluatoris operantur? Nam Sacramentum istud, quod accipis, Christi sermone conficitur &c. Quod si tantum valuit sermo Heliæ, vt ignem de Cælo deponeret, non valebit Christi Sermo, vt species mutet Elementorum? De totius mundi operibus legisti: Quia ipse dixit, & facta sunt, ipse mandauit, & creata sunt: Sermo ergo Christi, qui potuit ex nihilo facere, quod non erat, non potest ea, quæ sunt, in id mutare, quod non erant? Non enim minus est nouas rebus dare, quàm mutare Naturas.* Perhaps thou mayst say; I see another thing, how prouest thou to me, that I take the body of Christ? And this remaineth yet for vs to proue. What then, or how great examples may we vse, to proue, that it is not that, which Nature formed, but what benediction hath consecrated? And that there is greater force of Benediction, then of Nature, for euen Nature it

selfe

selfe is changed by Benediction? Moyses houlding a wand in his hand, did cast it from him, and it became a serpent &c. Now if Mans Benediction, or blessing be of such force, as that it can chang Nature, what do we say of that diuine Cõsecration where the very words of our Lord our Sauiour doe worke? for this Sacrament, which thou takest, is made by the speach of Christ. And if the speach of *Elias* was of such power, as to draw fire from heauen, shall not the words of Christ be of force to chang the formes of the Elements? Thou hast read of the workes of the whole world: Because he spake the word, they are made; he commanded, and they are created. Therefore the words of Christ, which of nothing could make that, which was not, can they not chang those things, which are, into that, which afore they were not? for it is not a lesse matter to giue new natures to things, then to chang Natures.] So cleare, and euident is *S. Ambrose* in these places for a true, and reall chang in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

S. Cyril of *Ierusalem* Catechesi 4. *Aquam aliquando mutauit in Vinum* &c. *our Lord did once by his sole will in Cana of Galilee turne water into Wyne, which is neere to Bloud, and is he not worthy to be belieued, that he hath changed wyne into bloud? Wherefore with all assuredneſſe let vs take the body, and bloud of Christ: for vnder the forme of Bread is giuen to thee his Body; and vnder the forme of Wine is giuen his Bloud.*].

The same Father in the same Booke also saith thus: *Ne ergo consideres tamquam nudum panem, & nudum vinum, corpus enim est, & sanguis Christi, secundum ipsius Domini verba: Quamuis enim sensus hoc tibi suggerit; tamen fides te confirmet, ne ex gustu rem indices &c. Hoc sciens, & pro certissimo*

certissimâ habens, panem hunc, qui videtur à nobis, non esse panem, etiamsi gustus panem esse sentiat, sed esse Corpus Christi: Et vinum quod à nobis conficitur, tametsi sensui gustus vinum esse videatur, non tamen vinum, sed Sanguinem Christi esse: which latter words are afore related. Doe not then consider it as bare Bread, or bare Wine; for it is the Body, and Bloud of Christ according to the word of our Saviour himselfe. For though sense may suggest this to thee, yet let thy faith so confirme this, as that thou judge not the matter from thy taste.] And againe after. *Hoc sciens* &c. *This knowing, and accounting it as most certaine, that this Bread, which we see, is not Bread, though our Taste do tell us that it is Bread, but it is the Body of Christ; and the Wine, which we behould, though it seemeth wine to our sense of Taste, yet it is not Wine, but the Bloud of Christ.*] And can any Catholike at this time speake more plainly, then are the sayings of this Father? One, who is most ancient, learned, and of whole booke (from whence these testimonies are produced) there was neuer any doubt made.

S. Cyprian serm. de Cœna Dom. Panis iste, quē Dominus Discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed naturâ mutatus, Omnipotentia Verbi factus est Caro, & sicut in persona Christi Humanitas apparebat, & latebat Diuinitas; ita Sacramento visibili ineffabiliter diuina se infudit Essentia. This Bread, the which our Lord gaue to his Disciples, is changed not in outward appearance, but in substance, and by the Omnipotency of the Word it is made Flesh. And as in the Person of Christ the Humanity did appeare, and the Diuinity did lye hid; so in the visible Sacrament, the diuine Essence hath ineffably infused it selfe.] But what Omnipotency is required to giue a signification to any substance?

stance? Or if the Change be only by adding a new signification, how can the Bread be said to be changed, *non effigie, sed natura?* Lastly, the Diuinity was truly, and really latent in Christs Humanity, therfore the Body, and Bloud must be truly and really latent vnder the formes of Bread, and Wine; which to be *Cyprians* meaning appeareth euen by the word *Ineffabiliter*, there added by him; but what difficulty, or mysterie is it, that Bread should signify Christ?

Tertullian l. 2. ad Vxorem: where speaking of Christian Women that are married to Gentiles, and shewing that such marriages are hurtfull to the receauing of the Blessed Sacrament, thus saith: *Non sciet Maritus &c. The Husband shall not know, what thou doest tast before all other meates; and if he did, he belieueth not the Bread to be him, whom it is said to be.*] Which wordes do euidently imply a Change of the Bread into the Body of Christ.

Irenæus lib. 4. *contra Hæreses*. cap. 34. disputing against such Heretikes, as denyed Christ to be the Sonne of the Creatour, thus disputeth: *Quomodo autem constabit iis &c. How shall it be made euident to such men, that Bread (wherupon thankes are giuen) to be the Body of Christ, and the Cup, the Bloud of him, if they will not acknowledge him to be the Sonne of the Maker of the World? That is, the Word of him, by the which Word, the Wood doth fructifie, the Springs do flow; who first giueth a kind of grasse, then an Eare of corne, lastly the Eare full of wheate.*] Heere we are to obserue, that *Irenæus* proueth Christ to be the Creatour from this, that Bread by force of Consecration is made the Body of Christ; therfore he belieued that Bread was really, and truly changed into the Body of Christ, and not only in signification; for it is not an imposition

of a new signification, but a true, and reall chang which necessarily requireth Gods Omnipotency.

(a) *True serpents.*] Exod. 7.
(b) *Non minus est.*] Ambros. *de mysterijs initiand. c.* 9.
(c) *Ego sum Dominus.*] Malach. 3.
(d) *The Apostle.*] 1. Cor. 10.

OF

OF THEIR TESTIMONIES CONTEYNING

The Comparisons of the Eucharist with other Great Mysteries.

CHAP. IIII.

A THIRD point (which indeed is the Céter wherin the Lines of diuers such passages doe meet) manifesting the Fathers beliefe heerein, may be the Obseruation of their Comparisons of the Eucharist with other things. Thus they compare it with the *Paschal Lambe*, with the *Manna*, with *Panis Propositionis*; teaching, that it doth transcend all these, as much as a Diuine, and inconsumptible substance excells a terrene, and corruptible, the Body the shaddow, and the Truth the Figure. But if Christs Body be heere only by representation, then is the Eucharist a thing corruptible, a shadow, and a meere

meere Figure; and then may our Sauiour worthily vse towards them the expostulation in *Esay*, *Cui* (a) *comparastis me*.

Others also in regard of the sublimity therof, compare it with the *Creation* (as I touched before) where (not to insist in other points) we find, that by force of the Creation, all Creatures are conteyned in the Creatour (for *in ipso viuimus* &c.) and by force of this Sacrament, the Creatour is conteyned (after a peculiar manner) vnder the formes of some of his meanest Creatures.

Some likewise do teach (besides other such comparisons) that Christ in the Sacrament is to the eye of the soule, as when Angells by assuming bodyes appeared to Men, though these being spirituall, seemed corporall, and Christ being Corporall appeareth heere only as spirituall.

Finally, diuers of them, seeme to equall it with the Mysterie of the *Incarnation*; and one Father resembleth the difficulty herein to that, where Christ (being as well God as Man) was borne of a Woman, and a Virgin. Now, if the chiefest obscuritie in the Eucharist doth rest in Types, Representations, and Resemblances, how cold, disproportionable, dissorting, yea absurd and false are the comparisons heere made with those former stupendious Mysteries of Christianity, and particulerly of the Incarnation? Where (to omit all other passages therof aboue our capacity) we find the Vine to bud out of the Branch; the Ocean to flow from a shallow Riuer; and the Sunne to borrow it light from a small Starre.

First then occurreth *S. Leo* serm. 7. *de Passione Dom.* who thus saith: *Vt ergo Vmbra* &c. That therfore the Shadowes

dowes might giue place to the Body, and Images, or Resemblances to the presence of the Truth, the ancient obseruation is taken away by a new Sacrament; the Hoast is changed into an Hoast, bloud excludeth bloud, and the Legall Solemnity whiles it is changed, is fulfilled, and accomplished.

S. Augustine l. 3. Trinit. c. 10. *Illas etiam Nubes &c. What man knoweth, how those Clouds, and Fires were made, which the Angells assumed, and tooke on to signify, what they were to deliuer or speake, yea though our Lord, or the Holy Ghost appeared in these formes? Euen as Infants knew not that, which is placed vpon the Altar, and consumed after the celebration of Piety is finished, how it is made, and by what meanes it is vsed in Religion. And if they neuer learned, either by their owne experience, or of others, and should neuer see the formes of those things, but in the celebration of Sacraments, when it is offered, & giuen, and said to them by most graue authority, whose Body, and Bloud it is, they would beliue no otherwise, but that our Lord appeared only in that forme to the sight of men, and that kind of liquour only flowed from his wounded side.* Heere we are to note, that these Infants could not beleeue, that those things which they there did see, were the Body, and Bloud of Christ, only by way of signification; but truly, and properly. For of themselues they could not vnderstand these Tropes; neither can it be said, that these children had a false faith, for it is said, they beleeued so, *Authoritate grauissima.*

Againe, *lib. 2. contra litteras Petiliani*, c. 37. *Aliud est Pascha, quod Iudæi de oue celebrant, aliud quod nos in Corpore & sanguine Domini accipimus:* There is one *Pascha*, which they yet celebrate of the Lamb: but that is another, which we receaue in the Body, and Bloud of our Lord. But if he should speake of our Lords Body in signe only, his

words

words were false, because the Paschall Lamb was in signification the Body of Christ, as well as the Bread; as is proued aboue.

He also in *epist.* 86. *ad Casulanum*, where reprehending one *Vrbicus*, for teaching that the Law was so turned into the Ghospell, as that a sheep should giue place to Bread, and Bloud to the Cup, thus writeth: *Dicit cessisse pani pecus* &c. *Vrbicus* sayth, *that sheepe did giue place to Bread, as being ignorant, that euen then* Panes Propositionis, *the breads of Proposition, were wont to be placed vpon the Table of the Lord, and that now himselfe taketh part of the body of the immaculate Lambe: in lyke sort, he sayth, that Bloud did giue place to the Cup, not remembring, that himselfe now taketh Bloud in the Cup.*] And then a litle after *S. Augustine* subioyneth: *Quantò ergo melius &c. How much better, and more agreeingly might* Vrbicus *haue sayd, that those ancient things did so passe away, & so became new in Christ, that the Altar should giue place to the Altar, the sword to the sword, fire to fire, bread to bread, sheep to sheep, bloud to bloud.*] But heere *Vrbicus* (according to the sentence of our Aduersaries) did not erre, for if we respect the signe, or representation only, Christ was no lesse in the Sheep of the Old Law, then now in Bread; and his Bloud no lesse in that Bloud, then in our Wyne. And therefore in our Aduersaries iudgements, the sheep did truly giue place to Bread, and Bloud to Wyne.

S. Hierome in Comment. Psal. 109. *Quomodo Melchisedech &c. Euen as Melchisedech being King of Salem offered vp Bread, and Wyne; so thou offerest vp thy Body, and Bloud, being true bread, and true Bloud. This our Melchisedech hath deliuered to vs these Mysteryes, which now we enioy, for it is he, who sayd: Qui manducat carnem meam, & bibit sanguinem*

mmeum &c.] In this place the body, and bloud of Christ is cleerely opposed to the Bread, and Wine of *Melchisedech*: And his Body, and Bloud is heere called *True Bread*, and *True Bloud* (to wit, in regard of the effect, which is to nourish our Soules, but not in respect of Nature) for if we respect the Nature of Bread, the Bread of *Melchisedech* was true Bread.

He also in *Comment. c. 1. Epist. ad Titum. Tantum interest inter Panes Propositionis &c. There is as great difference betweene* Panes Propositionis (*the Shew-Bread*) *and the Body of Christ, as there is betweene the Image, and the Truth; betweene the Examples of Truths, and those Truths, which are prefigured by the Examples.*] Where we are to note, that in this place *Hierome* entreateth particularly of the Eucharist. Now if in the Eucharist be the Truth which was figured *per panes Propositionis*, then there is not in the Eucharist materiall Bread signifying the Body of Christ, but the true Body it selfe; for the body of Christ (euen in the judgement of all) was that Truth, which was prefigured by those Breads.

S. *Chrysostome Homil. 24. in 1. ad Cor.* compares the *Magi* with us, saying to this effect, that the *Magi* had this body in the Manger, but we haue it vpon the Altar; They had it only in the armes of a woman, but we in the hands of a Priest; they only saw the simple body of Christ, but we see the same Body, but withall doe know his power, and vertue. Thus in this *Antithesis* doth S. *Chrysostome* conclude, that we haue his body in a more worthy sort, then the *Magi* had it; which he could not affirme truly, if we haue his Body only in signe, and representation.

And *Homil. 51. in Matth. Adeamus Christum &c. Let*

euery one of vs, which are ſicke, come to Chriſt; for if thoſe, which only touched the edge of his garment, were all perfectly recouered, how much more ſhall we be ſtrengthened, if we ſhall haue him whole in vs?] Heere he cannot ſpeake of Chriſt as in ſigne only, in that, there is not ſo great a vertue of the ſigne of Chriſt, as was of the hemme of his garment.

Likewiſe, *Homil. 24. in priorem epiſt. ad Corinth.* he ſaith: *Dum in hac vita ſumus, vt terra nobis Cœlum ſit, ſacrum hoc myſterium: Aſcende igitur ad Cœli portas, & diligenter attende, imo non Cœli, ſed Cœli Cœlorum, & tunc quod dicimus intuebere. Etenim quod ſummo honore dignum eſt, id tibi in terra oſtendam. Num quemadmodum in Regijs non parietes, non tectum aureum, ſed Regium Corpus in Throno ſedens omnium præſtantiſſimum eſt: ita quoq; in Cœlis regium Corpus, quod nunc in Terra videndum tibi proponitur; neq; enim Angelos, neq; Archangelos, non Cœlos, non Cœlos Cœlorum, ſed ipſum horum omnium Dominum oſtendo:* Whileſt we heere liue, this Myſterie maketh, that the Earth becommeth Heauen to vs. Therfore aſcend to the gates of Heauen, yea not only of Heauen, but of the higheſt Heauen, and obſerue diligently, and then thou ſhalt behould, what we heere ſay: for what is worthy of chiefeſt honour, that I will ſhew thee heere vpon the earth. For, euen as in Princes Courts, not the walls, nor the Chamber, or Cloth of Eſtate, but the Body of the Prince ſitting in his Throne, is the chiefeſt thing there: euē ſo is the like of that Princely Body in Heauen, which is heere vpon the earth ſet forth to thee to behould; for heere I do not ſhew thee the Angells, nor Archangells, not the Heauens, nor the higheſt Heauens, but I ſhew thee the Lord of all theſe. But there is none, but he had rather ſee the Angells, and Archan-

changells, then Bread, and Wine representing onely Christ.

And also *Chrysostome* in the same place maketh another comparison in these words following: *Si puer Regius &c. If the Princes Child clothed in Purple, and crowned with the Diademe should be carryed by thee, wouldest thou not (casting away all other things vpon the ground) take him into thy armes? But now heere, when thou takest, not the Sonne of any Prince, being but a Man, but the only begotten Sonne of God, art thou not affraid, and doest not thou cast from thee the care of all secular things?*] But if *Chrysostome* did heere speake of Christ only in Signe, and representation, the comparison should haue bene made only between the Image, or Picture of the Kings Sonne, and not with the Sonne himselfe.

And *Homil. ad Neophytos. Sicut Regnantium statuæ &c. Euen as the Statuaes, or Images of Princes haue bene accustomed to succour such, as haue fled to them for Sanctuary, and this not because they are made of brasse, but in that they doe beare the Image of the Prince; euen so that blood did free* (meaning that Bloud of the Lamb in the old Testament, which was sprinkled vpon the Posts to free the *Israelites* from the striking Angell) *not because it was blood, but because it did figure out the comming of this Blood. But now if the Enemy shall see, not the blood of the Type cast vpon the postes, or walles, but the blood of Truth shining in the mouthes of the faithfull, he will much more withdraw himselfe from hence. For if the Angell gaue place to the Example, how much more will the Enemy be terrified, if he shall behould the Truth it self?*] In which place we see, that *Chrysostome* placeth the truth of the Bloud, not in the mind, but in the mouths of the Faithfull.

And *Homil. 51. in Matth. O quot meo dicunt &c.* O how many doe now say, *I would see the forme of Christ, and his fauour, I would see his vestments, and euen his shooes! Now thou seest him, thou touchest him, thou eatest him.*] Where he meaneth, that we see, feele, and eate Christ truly, and really vnder those formes of Bread, and Wine, which are properly seene, and touched.

Againe, he saith in the same place: that there was neuer Shepheard, who fed his shep with his owne flesh, as Christ did, and that diuers Mothers are to be found, who deliuer ouer their Infants to others to be noursed, contrary to the proceedings of our Sauiour: which comparisons can haue no fitting proportion, if we eate the Body of Christ only in Figure, and signe.

Lastly (to omit for breuities sake diuers others of his similitudes) he thus writeth *Hom. 2. ad Pop. Antiochenum: Helias melotem &c. Helias did leaue to his disciple his vestement, but the Sonne of God ascending to Heauen, did leaue his flesh; But Helias by leauing it, was disuested therof, whereas Christ leauing his flesh to vs, yet ascending to Heauen, there also hath it.*] So frequent is this holy Father in Comparisons, and Similitudes, all brought in to shew the excellency of that thing, which we receaue in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; which if it were not the body, and bloud of Christ, then were these comparisons most cold, and disproportionable.

Gaudentius Tract. 2. de Exodo. teacheth, that the Iewes had not all one *Paschal Lambe*, but diuers, in that euery family did kill it peculiar Lambe; but that among the Christians one, and the same Lambe (to wit, the body, and bloud of Christ) is offered vp, and eaten in all the Churches. Which words signify, that the body of

Christ

Christ is not offered vp only in representation, since in that sense the Iewes had one, and the same Lambe, in that all their Lambs did signify one Lamb, to wit Christ.

S. Basil l. 2. de Baptismo c. 2. thus writeth [*Si tales minæ &c. If such threats be ordayned against those, who come rashly to such holy things as are sanctified by Man; what shall we say of him, who is temerarious, and rash towards such, and so great a Mysterie? For by how much Christ is greater then the Temple, according to the voyce of our Lord; by so much it is more greiuous, and terrible, rashly to touch the body of Christ in impurity of soule, then to approach to Rammes, or Bulls &c.*] But this saying of *S. Basil* cannot be true, except the body of Christ be really in the Eucharist. For betweene Christ, and the Rammes sacrificed by the Iewes the difference is infinite; but betweene those Rammes signifying Christ, and bread figuring our Sauiour, the difference is but small.

S. *Ambrose lib. de Mysterijs initiandis*, c. 9. teacheth, that a more excellent meate is giuen to vs in the Eucharist, then euer the *Manna* was to the Iewes. The like he hath *l. 4. de Sacramentis c. 3. 4. & 5.* But *Manna* was both for substance, and signification (as is proued afore) better then bread, only representing the body of Christ.

Againe, *lib. 6. de Sacramentis c. 1. Sicut verus est Filius Dei &c. Euen as our Lord Iesus Christ is the true Sonne of God, not as Men are his Sonnes by grace, but as a Sonne of the Substance of the Father: so it is true Flesh, euen as himselfe said, which we take.*] Out of which sentence it followeth, that as Christ is truly and really the Sonne of God: So is that, which we take in the Eucharist, the true body, and bloud of Christ.

Againe, *lib. de Mysterijs initiandis c. 9.* he proueth

the same from the mysterie of the Incarnation in these words: *Liquet, quòd præter naturæ ordinem Virgo generauit, & hoc quod conficimus, Corpus ex Virgine est. Quid hic quæris Naturæ ordinem in Christi corpore, cùm præter naturã sit ipse Dominus Iesus partus ex Virgine?* It is manifest, that a Virgin brought forth a Sonne beyond the course of Nature; And this Body, which we make, proceedeth from the Virgin. Why doest thou heere expect the course of Nature, since our Lord Iesus is borne of a Virgin aboue nature?] But if the Bread did only signify our Sauiours Body in the Eucharist, this proofe of *S. Ambrose* had bene superfluous.

S. Hilarius lib. 8. de Trinitate, speaking of the Truth of the Body, and Bloud in the Eucharist, thus concludeth: *An hoc veritas non est &c. What, is not this Truth? Let it not be a truth to those, who deny Christ Iesus to be true God.*] Thus *Hilarius* heere proueth the Mysterie of the Eucharist, by the Mysterie of the Trinity.

S. Athanasius (as he is cited by *Theodoret in 2. Dialog.*) thus writeth: *Corpus est, cui dicit &c. It is a Body, to whom it was said*, Sede à dextris meis, *of which Body the Diuells with all the wicked Powers, as also the Iewes, and Grecians were Enemies; by meanes of which Body* (Christ) *was both the High Priest, and an Apostle; and this Body is specified in that Mysterie, which is deliuered to vs, when himselfe said: This is my Body which is deliuered for you, and the bloud of the New Testament, not of the Old, which is shed for you. But Diuinity hath neither a Body, nor Bloud.*] Heere he proueth, that Christ hath a true Body, in that Christ as an High Priest gaue his Body to vs in those wordes, *Hoc est Corpus meum*: but if his true body were not deliuered to vs therby, his reason would proue nothing against the

Here-

Heretikes denying the Truth of his Body, in that it might be replyed, that the Eucharist was but a Figure of the apparent, and seeming body which they taught, that Christ had.

S. Cyprian sermone de Cœna Domini, saith: *Cœna dispensata &c. The Supper of those sacraments all Banquets being prepared, the Old, and New Institutions did there meete together, and the Lamb (which the Ancient Tradition proposed) being spent, the Maister gaue to his Disciples an inconsumptible meate.*] Heere by the words, *Cibum inconsumptibilem*, cannot be vnderstood the Body of Christ, as it is eaten by Faith, because in that the Iewes by their Paschall Lamb had that meate (to wit by representation) as well as we Christians. Neither by the said words can be vnderstood the Bread in the Eucharist, because Bread is as well consumptible, and to be spent, as a Lambe is.

In the same Sermon he also saith: (of which place I haue entreated before) *Sicut in Personâ Christi &c. Euen as in the Person of Christ, his Humanity appeared, but his Diuinity was hid, or latent, so in the visible Sacrament, the Diuine Essence doth ineffably infuse it selfe.*] From which words, the truth of the Doctrine of the Eucharist is proued from the Mystery in the Incarnation.

Origen homil. 7. in Lib. Numer: Tunc in ænigmate erat Manna cibus, nunc autem in specie caro verbi Dei est verus cibus, sicut ipse dixit, Quia caro mea est verè cibus. Then (to wit in the Old Law) the Manna was meate obscurely, & Enigmatically, but now indeed the Flesh of the Word of God is true meate, euen as himselfe said: *Quia caro mea verè est cibus.*] But the Manna was the body of Christ tropically, and figuratiuely.

Tertullian lib. de Idolatria, thus saith: *Prob. Scelus! semel*

seuel Iudei &c. O Villany! the Iewes once offered violence vnto Christ, but these Men dayly do wrong his body. O that their hands might be cut off!] In which place he inueigheth against certaine men, who made such Priests, or at the least Deacons, which were artificers, or makers of Idolls. But if *Tertullian* had thought, that there were only Bread in the Eucharist representing the Body of our Sauiour, he would not compare such, as handled the Sacrament vnworthily with those which crucified Christ. Where also we are to note, that he there speaketh not of such, who with affectation, and intended purpose did wrong Christ by violating the Sacraments, but of those only, who being sinners, dared to deliuer the Sacrament to the Communicants.

Irenæus l. 4 contra Hæres. c. 34. Quemadmodum qui est à terra panis, percipiens vocationem Dei, iam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constans, terrena, & cœlesti; sic & corpora nostra percipientia Eucharistiã, iam non sunt corruptibilia, spem resurrectionis habentia. Euenas the Bread proceeding from the Earth, receaiing the inuocation of God, is not now common Bread, but it is the Eucharist, consisting of two things, to wit, a terrene thing, and a celestiall thing; so our Bodyes receauing the Eucharist are not corruptible, as hauing thereby the hope of rising againe.] Where *Irenæus* maketh a Comparison betweene the Eucharist, and the Article of the Resurrection. But our Body really & truly after the Resurrection shall become Immortall, and not in signification only, therefore the Bread is truly become the Body of Christ, and not in signification only. Now how the Eucharist may be termed *terrena*, see *S. Augustine*, and *S. Ambrose* in the sixt chapter of this 2. Tract.

S. Iustinus

S. Iustinus Martyr, in Apolog. 2. ad Antoninum Imperatorem, saith: *Non enim vt communem Panem, neque communem Potum hæc sumimus; Sed quemadmodum per Verbum Dei Incarnatus Iesus Christus Saluator noster, & carnem, & sanguinem pro salute nostra habuit: sic etiam per preces Verbi Dei, ab ipso Eucharistiam factum cibum, ex quo sanguis, & carnes nostræ per mutationem aluntur, illius Incarnati Iesu, & carnem, & sanguinem esse edocti sumus.* We do not take these, as common Bread, and common Drinke; but as Iesus Christ our Sauiour being Incarnated by the Word of God, had flesh, and bloud for our health & saluation: euen so we learne, that through the prayers of the Word of God, that meate (whereby our bloud, and flesh are nourished through the alteratiõ therof) being made the Eucharist, is the Flesh, and Bloud of Iesus, who was incarnated.] In which wordes, there is a comparison betweene the Eucharist, and the Incarnation of Christ, and he proueth the Catholike doctrine of the Eucharist from the Mysterie of the Incarnation, inferring, that by the same power the Bread might be made the Body of Christ, by the which power God was Incarnated: but if he did vnderstand, that the Bread was the Body by representation only, then in vaine is brought the Example of the Incarnation, since it is no Miracle, that Bread should signifie the Body of Christ. Add heerto, that *Iustinus Martyr* if he did meane the Body only in signe, had reason to explane himselfe to the Emperour, in that he heere did write an Apology for the Christians, to whome (besides other crimes) it was obiected that in the mysteries of their Religion they did eate Mans flesh.

(a) *Cui comparastis me?*] Esa. 46.

OF THEIR TESTIMONIES CONFESSING *The inexplicable greatneſſe of this Myſterie.*

CHAP. V.

THE fourth Claſſis may conteyne ſuch paſſages of the Fathers, wherin is acknowledged a Supreme Myſterie in the Euchariſt. For firſt, they teach, that it tranſgreſſing the bounds of humane capacity, is to be apprehended only by faith. Thus aduancing the dignity, and worth of faith, as being able to vnderſtand that, which the vnderſtanding (of which Faith is but an Act) cannot naturally vnderſtand. So cloudy, & darke is that Faculty of the mind, except the myſts therof be diſpelled, and diſſipated by the illuminating beames of Gods grace. Hence it ariſeth, that they are very frequent in their exhortations, that we ſhould not fluctuate in a-

ny vncertainty of Iudgment, but assure our selues (by disclayming from sense, humbling our Iudgments, and voyding our minds of all preiudice of opinion) of the infallible Truth therof, since it is wrought by the vertue of his words, who is Truth it selfe (a) *Ego sum Veritas, & Via*. So well those holy Doctours did know, that the more Chrystalline, & cleare the chiefest faculties of our Soules are become, and the more polished, & freed from all naturall blemishes the glasse therof is, the more perfectly we may behould this high Mysterie, since during our exile heere, all such abstruse difficulties we do but see as it were *per* (b) *speculum in aenigmate*. But when we are arriued by meanes of death into our Countrey (for Heauen is the soules proper Orbe) then all such heauenly mysteries, being now ouer ponderous, and weighty for vs, as pressing our vnderstanding too much; shall become there most light, and easie to be apprehended, according to that (to speake allusiuely) in Philosophy, *Nullum Elementum ponderat in sua propria Sphæra*: for then we shall contemplate not only all Creatures, but other thinges worthy of knowledge, intuitiuely in God, as now we do behould God discursiuely in his Creatures.

But to returne. The Fathers finally do referre the miraculous change made in the Eucharist, only to Gods Illimitable Puissance, within which vast circumference, euery thing is conteyned, that may in any sort exist, confessing fully, that it cannot be wrought by any inferiour Power, for he only is able to performe such (as I may terme them) possible Impossibilities; since his Omnipotency doth facilitate that, which otherwise in Nature is not factible.

Heere now I refer to the Iudgment of the impartiall

Reader, how vnaptly, and vntowardly all such passages of the Fathers are applied to Bread, and Wyne, signifying only the body, and bloud of our Saviour. We will then come to those Testimonyes acknowledging so great a Mysterie heerein.

Eusebius Emyssenus (or whosoeuer else was the Author of that Treatise, entitled *Sermo de Corpore Domini*, which Booke was alledged by *Paschasius Corbeiensis* eight hundred yeares since) thus writeth in the said booke: *Recedat omne infidelitatis ambiguum &c. Let all doubt of infidelity depart from thee, since he, who is the Author of the gyft, is witnesse of the Truth.*] And againe: *Ad cognoscendum &c. To know, and perceaue the Sacrifice of the true Body, let the Power of him who consecrateth it, confirme thee therein.*] So cleare is this Father herein.

S. Leo Serm. 14. de Passione Domini: Ipsum per omnia &c. Let vs tast him fully, both in spirit, and in flesh.]

S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria l. 4. in Ioan.* explicating those words, *Quomodo potest hic nobis carnem suam dare ad manducandum?* thus writeth: *Firmam fidem Mysteriis adhibentes, numquam in tam subtilibus rebus illud* Quomodo, *aut cogitemus, aut proferamus* &c. We firmely believing these mysteres, neuer let vs in such high points either thinke, or bring forth this word *Quomodo*, How? &c.]

S. Augustine l. 3. de Trinitate c. 4. Quod cùm per manus &c. *Which thing* (speaking of Bread) *when it is brought by mens hands to that visible forme, it is noe otherwise sanctified to be so great a Sacrament, then by the inuisible working of the spirit of God, since all those things, which are in this worke performed by corporall motions, God doth worke.*] But this working of the holy Ghost is not necessary, that Bread should signify only the Body of Christ. Adde hereto,

to, that *S. Augustine* in this place doth reckon the worke heere in the Eucharist among other great Miracles, to wit, the Raine of *Helias* obtayned of God, the Wand of *Aaron* which budded fresh, the Wand of *Moyses* turned into a Serpent, the water turned into wyne by *Christ*.

And in *Psal.* 33. *Conc.* 1. vpon those words of the Psalme, *Et ferebatur manibus suis* &c. thus writeth. *Hoc quomodo potest fieri in homine, quis intelligat? Quis enim portatur in manibus suis? Manibus aliorum potest portari homo, manibus suis nemo portatur. Quomodo intelligatur in ipso Dauid, secundum literam non inuenimus; in Christo autem inuenimus: ferebatur enim Christus in manibus suis, quando commendans ipsum corpus suum, ait, Hoc est Corpus meum: ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis.* Who can vnderstand, how this can happen in Man? For who is carried in his owne hands? A man may be carried in the hands of another, but in his owne hands he cannot be carryed. How this may be literally vnderstood in *Dauid*, we find not, but in Christ we find: for Christ was carryed in his owne hands, when commending his body, he sayd, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, for then did he carry that body in his owne hands.] But if Christ did carry his body in his owne hands, only in signe, and representation (as a Man bearing about him the picture of himselfe) then were it no difficult thing; and yet S. *Augustine* saith, it is a thing impossible, and cannot be performed, but only by Christ. Neither do our Aduersaries satisfy this place in replying, that Christ did carry himselfe in a Sacrament, but none but Christ can institute a Sacrament, and consequently none can carry themselues, as Christ did. This, I say, auayleth nothing, because our Aduersaries doe confesse, that Christ is said to carry himselfe in the Sacrament,

not because a Sacrament is an Instrument of co iferring Grace (for this they deny) but because it is a signe of Christ; and so in this last respect there is no difficultie for one to carry himselfe.

Finally *S. Augustine, tract. 26. in Ioannem*, explicating that, *Panis, quem ego dabo, Caro mea est*, thus writeth: *Hoc quando caperet caro, quod dixit panem carnem? vocatur Caro, quod non capit Caro.* When would flesh conceaue, or apprehend how he called Bread Flesh? That is called Flesh, which Flesh apprehendeth not.] But flesh, or a sensuall vnderstanding may easily conceaue, that bread may be called flesh figuratiuely, and by way of representation only.

S. Hierome epist. ad Hedibiam quæst. 2. Nec Moyses dedit &c. Neyther did Moyses giue to vs true Bread, but our Lord Iesus is the Guest, and the Banquet, the Person eating, and the thing eaten.] But it cannot be truly said, that *Moyses* did not giue *Panem verum*, that is, the body of Christ, if the Eucharist were no otherwise the Body of Christ, then by signification. Adde heerto, that *S. Hierome* heere implyeth a difficulty, in being the thing eaten, and the party eating; which point cannot be referred to Christ eating Bread, which only representeth his Body.

S. Chrysostome, Homil. 60. ad popul. Antiochenum, saith: *Credamus vbiq; Deo, nec repugnemus ei, etiamsi sensui, & cogitationi nostræ absurdum esse videatur, quod dicit. Superet & sensum, & rationem nostram sermo, quæso, ipsius, quod in omnibus rebus, sed præcipuè in mysteriis faciamus, non illa, quæ ante non iacentes solummodo aspicientes, sed verba eius quoq; tenentes: nam verbis illius defraudari non possumus? Sensus noster deceptu facillimus est, quoniam ergo ille dixit, Hoc*

est

est Corpus meum, nulla dubitatione teneamur, sed credamus.]
Let vs beleeue God in euery thing, neither let vs gainsay him, though what he saith may seeme absurd to our sense and cogitation. I beseech thee therefore, that his speach may ouercome our Sense, and Reason. Which point we are to obserue in all things; but especially in the Holy Mysteries, not only beholding those things, which lye before vs; but also laying full hould of his words; for his words cannot deceaue vs, but our sense may easily be deceaued.

Also *in Homil. 51. in Matth.* *Qui maius, id est, animam &c.* *He that laid downe a greater thing for thee (to wit his soule) why should he disdayne to deliuer to thee his Body? Therfore let vs Priestes, as well as others heare how admirable a thing is graunted to vs; Let vs heare (I beseech you) and let vs tremble therat, for he hath deliuered his Flesh to vs he hath laid downe himselfe to be sacrificed.*]

And the same Father *l. 3. de Sacerdotio.* *O miraculum! ô Dei benignitatem! &c.* *O the Miracle! ô the goodnesse of God! He that sitteth aboue with his Father, euen in the very same instant of tyme is handled with the hands of all, and deliuereth himselfe to such, as are willing to entertaine, and imbrace him.*]

Gaudentius tract. 2. *in Exod.* saith: *Quod annuntiatum est credas &c.* *Thou maist beleeue that, which is shewed thee, for that, which thou takest is the body of that Heauenly Bread, and the bloud of that sacred Vine, for when he deliuered consecrated Bread, and Wine to his Disciples, he said: Hoc est Corpus meum. Hic est Sanguis meus. Let vs beleeue him, whom heretofore we haue beleeued, for Truth knoweth not to lye.*]

S. Ephrem lib. *De Natura Dei minimè scrutanda.* c. 5.

thus

thus writeth: *Quid scrutaris inscrutabilia? Si ista curiosè ri-maris, iam non fidelis, sed curiosus vocaberis. Esto fidelis, atq; innocens, participa immaculato corpori Domini tui fide plenissima, certus quòd agnum ipsum integrum comedis.* Why doest thou search things which are inscrutable? If thou doest weigh these things curiously, then thou shalt be called not faithfull, but curious. Be thou Faithfull, and Innocent; participate thou of the immaculate Body of thy Lord, being assured through a most strong faith, that thou doest eate the very whole Lambe it selfe.]

And the same Father after in the said booke: *Hoc sanè excedit omnem admirationem &c. This verily exceedeth all Wonder, all Thought, and all Speach, which the only Begotten Sonne of God Christ our Sauiour hath performed to vs. He hath giuen to vs fire, and the spirit to eate, and drinke, to wit his Body, and Bloud.*] Heere the Myracle exceeding Mans capacity, the difficulty of belieuing it, and the inscrutablenesse therof do proue, that the Eucharist in his Iudgment, was not only materiall bread signifying the body of Christ.

S. Gregorie Nazianzen Orat. 2. *de Paschate*, thus writeth: *Absq; confusione, & dubio come de corpus, & sanguinem bibe, si saltem vitæ desiderio teneris: neq; sermonibus, qui de carne habentur, fidem deneges, neq; ob passionem offendaris. Constans esto, firmus, & stabilis, in nulla re propter Aduersariorum sermones fluctues.* Eate his body, and drinke his bloud without any confusion, or doubt, if at least thou haue any desire of health; neither deny thy faith herein for any speaches, which may proceed of flesh, neither be thou scandalized by reason of his Passion. Be thou constant, firme, and stable, neither fluctuate, nor doubt thou by reason of any speaches of the Aduersaries.]

Where

Where we are to note, that he perſuadeth his Reader to this ſo great a Myſtery, though the Aduerſaries (to wit, the Gentile Philoſophers) doe ſcoffe thereat, meaning in that the Chriſtians belieued, that they did eate the Fleſh of Chriſt; which cohortation of *Nazianzene* were needleſſe, if only we doe eate the fleſh of Chriſt in ſigne, and Figure.

S. Gregorie Nyſſene Orat. Catechetica. c. 36. & 37. thus writeth: *Conſiderandum eſt, quomodo fieri queat, vt cùm vnum illud corpus aſſiduè per totum orbem terrarum, tot fidelium millibus impertiatur, totum cuiuſq; per partem euadat, & in ſeipſo totum permaneat.* It is to be conſidered, how it can be effected, that, that very one ſame Body can dayly throughout the whole world be diſtributed to ſo many thouſands of the faithfull, it notwithſtanding remayning whole in it ſelfe, and whole, or entyre in euery part.] But this were idely demanded, if the Body of Chriſt were eaten only in ſigne, ſince there is no difficulty in apprehending the eating of it in ſigne, and figure.

S. Ambroſe l. 4. de Sacramentis c. 5. ſaith: *Deinde ipſe Dominus Ieſus teſtificatur nobis, quòd corpus ſuum accipiamus, & ſanguinem, numquid debemus de eius fide, & teſtificatione dubitare?* Et infra: *Dicit tibi Sacerdos*, Corpus Chriſti, *tu dicis*, Amen. *Hoc eſt verum. Quod confitetur lingua, teneat affectus.*] Furthermore euen our Lord himſelfe doth teſtify vnto vs, that we take his Body, and Bloud. What ought we to doubt of his credit, and teſtimony? *And afterwards.* The Prieſt ſayth to thee, The Body of Chriſt, thou ſayſt, Amen. This is true: therefore let thy affection hold that, which thy tongue confeſſeth.]

The firſt Councell of *Nyce* (as it appeareth in the

Acts of the said Councell) thus saith: *Item etiam hic in diuina Mensa &c. Furthermore in this diuine Table, let vs not only with humility consider the Bread, & the Cup, but lifting vp our mind in faith, let vs vnderstand, that, in that sacred Table, there is placed that Lambe of God, who taketh away the sinns of the world, & that he is vnbloudily sacrificed by Priests: and we truly taking his precious Body, & Bloud, do beleiue the taking therof to be a signe of our Resurrection, and therfore we take not in a great quantitie, but in a small, that therby we may know it to be taken not for society, but for sanctification.*] In these words the Coūcell perswades vs that we should not rest in the formes of Bread, & Wine (as if nothing were there else) but that we are to consider, that there is the true Body, and Bloud of Christ, though to our Eye it seemeth otherwise.

Now that this is the meaning of the Coūcell, appeareth: First, because it there teacheth, that we do take *Pretiosum Corpus eius verè*, his precious Body truly: where the word *Verè* doth beare an opposition to that, which is in Figure. Secondly, in that the Councell saith: that the Lambe of God is sacrificed by Priests vpon the holy Table, which wordes cannot extend to Christ, as he is in heauen only. Thirdly, in that the Councell saith, that we are to apprehend by faith, that the Lambe of God is placed vpon that holy Table, therfore the Councell did teach, that Christ himselfe was vpon the Altar, and not only in Heauen, as our Aduersaries do hould. So forcible and strong is this graue Testimony of so Ancient, and Reuerend a Councell in defence of our Catholike doctrine heerin.

(a) *Veritas, & Via.*] Iohn 14.
(b) *Per speculum.*] 1. Cor. 13.

OF THEIR TESTIMONIES EXPRESSING

The effect of the Eucharist, and the veneration exhibited to the same.

CHAP. VI.

THE fifth Mount of the Fathers Authorities in this Controuersie is gathered, or heaped togeather out of such their Sentences, cõteyning the Effect, Vertue, and Energy of the Eucharist, as also their care, reuerence, and veneration exhibited to the same. Concerning the first point, they teach, that it is the Pledge of our Resurrection, and Saluation; that by it (to vse the Apostles phrase) we are made *diuinæ* (a) *consortes Naturæ*, that Christ is therby inwardly, and corporally vnited with vs. Which corporall vnion (being most precious) serues as a meanes to procure our coniunction (caused therby)

thereby) with him, in all vertues flowing from him, as from our Sauiour, and Redeemer; And therefore we are not only armed by force hereof against the assaults of all future temptations, but also Grace is deriued to vs, to haue a true loathing, and contrition of our former Impieties, & withall to receaue a full remission of the same; for we hold, that this Holy Mysterie is not only a Commemoration, but also an application of Christs death to vs, and we willingly acknowledge, that touching the expiation of our Sinnes, the fire of the Fathers wrath is only quenched in the Bloud of the Sonnes Passion.

All which Celestiall Operations, as streaming from the Blessed Eucharist, he may more easily believe, who will consider, that Christ is the proper Sphere, wherein the soule reposeth her selfe; His grace being the spirituall Ayre that she anhales, and drawes in, the which she no sooner ceaseth to Breath, then she ceaseth to lyue; for it is written, *She, who* (b) *liueth in sinne, dyeth while she liueth.*

Now as for the second Point; we gather out of their Writings, first that they were most sollicitous, & carefull, that no part of the Consecrated Hoast should fall vpon the ground; and if casually it did, then was that place scraped, and the small parcells thereof put in the fire. Secondly, that they did adore the Sacrament; which Action how can it be giuen by them without manifest danger of Idolatry, if nothing but Bread, and Wyne be there? Thirdly, that they taught, that the Eucharist was to be inuoked, according to that of *S. Basil: Verba Inuocationis, dum ostenditur Panis Eucharistiæ &c. quis Sanctorum nobis in Scripto reliquit?*

Finally, that euen Angells (*capitibus inclinatis*) did attend

attend vpon the Altar, whileſt the moſt dreadfull Sacrifice of Chriſts Body, and Bloud was offered vp in the formes of Bread, and Wyne: *Hoſtia in manibus* (ſayth one (c) Father) *adſunt Angeli, adſunt Archangeli, adeſt filius Dei; cum tanto horrore aſtant omnes*. Which Harmony, and Concent of doctrine in the monuments of ſo many of the Fathers; if it ſeeme harſh, and diſtunable to our nice Sectaryes, we meruayle not, ſince they haue vowed, that their eares ſhall receaue no other intelligence herein, then from their Neighbours, their Eyes. But we Catholikes, who cannot brooke to haue the humanity of Chriſt (which we aſſure our ſelues to be in the Euchariſt) diuorced from the Diuinity, doe eaſily beliene, that in this moſt holy Oblation, his Godhead is there wayted on with millions of Angells: No leſſe happy then are thoſe moſt bleſſed Spirits for enioyning the honor of ſuch an Attendance, then are thoſe men, in whom he vouchſafeth for the time to Inne, that in him themſelues may hope for euer after to dwell.

Firſt then *S. Cyril* of *Alexandria l. 4. in Ioan. c. 15.* thus writeth: *Sicut ſcintilla ignis* &c. *Euen as a ſparke of fyre lyghting vpon hay, or ſtraw, doth preſently inflame it all; euen ſo the word of God ioyned to our corruptible nature by meanes of the Euchariſt, doth make it all to riſe immortall, & glorious.*

And, *l. 10. in Ioan. c. 13. Non negamus recta nos fide* &c. *We do not deny, that we are ioyned with Chriſt ſpiritually in true faith, and ſincere charity, but we altogeather deny, that we are not in no ſort conioyned with him according to the fleſh, and we affirme it to be altogeather contrary to the diuine Scriptures.* And a little after, he thus enlargeth himſelfe: *An fortaſsis putat* &c. *What is it to be thought, that we know not*

the vertue of the mysticall Benediction? The which being in vs, doth it not make through the communication of the Flesh of Christ, Christ himselfe corporally to dwell in vs?] Where we see, that he teacheth, that we receaue Christ not only by Faith (as our Aduersaries do teach) but also corporally, so making an *Antitheſis*, or oppoſition between theſe two manners of receauing him.

S. Auguſtine l. 9. Confeſs. c. 13. ſpeaking of his Mother *Monica*, thus writeth: *Tantummodo do memoriam ſui &c. Only ſhe deſired, that ſhe might be remembred at thy Altar, where ſhe knew that Holy Sacrifice to be diſpenſed, by the which that Hand-writing, which was contrary to vs, is cancelled.*] But here this *Victima* or Sacrifice cannot be any thing, but the Fleſh of Chriſt, for the Bread was not ſacrificed for vs, and where he ſaith, that this ſacrifice is diſpenſed, or miniſtred, at, or from the Altar, he ſheweth that he meaneth not Chriſt, as he is taken by faith only, but bodily by mouth.

And, *Epiſt.* 118. *c.* 3. he teacheth great Reuerence to be giuen to the Euchariſt, ſaying, that ſuch as do frequent the Sacrament daily out of deuotion, or forbeare it ſometime for deuotion alſo, may be compared to *Zacheus*, or the *Centurion*, wherof the one ſaid, *Lord I am not worthy, that thou ſhouldeſt enter into my houſe*, the other receaued him into his houſe. Which compariſon had bene moſt diſproportionable, if we take nothing but Bread, as the ſigne of Chriſts Body.

And, *in Pſal.* 98. expounding thoſe words, *Adorate ſcabellum pedum eius*, ſaith: *That the Footſtoole of our Lords feete is the Earth, according to that of Eſay* 66. *Terra autem ſcabellum pedum meorum.* Now *S. Auguſtine* expounding how the Earth may be adored without ſinne, thus writeth:

teth: *Fluctuans conuerto me ad Christũ, quia ipsum quæro hic, & inuenio, quomodo sine impietate adoretur terra, adoretur Scabellum pedum eius; Suscepit enim de terra terram, quia Caro de terra est, & de carne Mariæ, carnem accepit. Et quia in ipsa carne hic ambulauit, & ipsam carnem manducandam nobis dedit ad salutem: Nemo autem illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adorauerit. Inuentum est quemadmodum adoretur tale Scabellum pedum Domini, vt non solùm non peccemus adorãdo, sed peccemus non adorando.* I doubting herein do turne my selfe to Christ, because I seeke him heere, and do find, how without any impiety the Earth may be adored, the footstoole of his feet may be adored; for he did take earth from earth, because flesh commeth of the earth, and he tooke flesh of the flesh of *Mary*. And because he did heere walke in that flesh, and gaue that flesh to be eaten by vs for our health: now no man doth eate that flesh, except he adore it before. Heere then it is found, how such a Footstoole of the feete of our Lord may be adored, so as that heere not only we do not sinne in adoring, but we sinne in not adoring.] Now heere it cannot be replyed, that the meaning of this Father is, that the faithfull doe eate the Body of Christ existing only in Heauẽ with the mouth of faith, because the Faithfull do only adore it. This is false, for euen according to the iudgment of *S. Augustine*, the wicked do adore the Body of Christ, and eate his Body from the Altar. For, *epist. 120. ad Honoratum c. 27.* where speaking of the wicked, he saith: *Adducti sunt ad Mensam Domini, & accipiunt de corpore, & sanguine eius, sed adorant tantum, non etiam saturantur, quia non imitantur.*

Finally, *S. Augustine l. 50. Homil. 26.* warneth most earnestly, that Men should be carefull, that no part of the

the Hoast should fall vpon the ground.

Chrysostome homil. 3. in epist. ad Ephes. Et tu ad salutarem hanc hostiam &c. And thou art ready to come to this healthfull hoast, which euen the Angells do behold with feare.] And, *Homil. de Eucharist. in Encenijs. Agnus Dei immolatur &c. The Lamb of God is offered vp in Sacrifice. The Seraphims are present couering their faces with wings.*] But how phantastical and imaginary a conceipt were it to thinke that these places can be applyed to Bread, and Wine, signifying only the Body, and Bloud of Christ?

Againe, *Homil. 60. ad Populum Antiochenum*, he saith: *Cogita quali sis insignitus honore &c. Bethinke thy selfe, with what honour thou art heere graced, what Table thou enioyest. We feed of that, and are vnited therewith, the which the Angells beholding are afraid, and dare not looke vpon the same in regard of the illustrious splendor thereof.*] And in the like sort, *Homil. 61. Huic & superna potestates &c. The higher powers doe assist, and waite hereupon, because they behold the vertue of the things there placed, more then we doe, and doe admire the inaccessible splendour, and lightnesse thereof.*] And that these places of this Father are to be taken literally, appeareth out of another place of his wrytings, to wit *l. 6. de Sacerdotio* in these words: *Ego verò & commemorantem quemdam audiui &c. I did ouer heare one reporting, who tould, that a certayne old and venerable Man (to whom many Mysteryes had afore bene reuealed) was vouchsafed by God to be made worthy of a Vision, and that during this tyme (viz. of celebrating the sacrifice of the Altar) he did see whole multitudes of Angells to descend suddenly downe (as much as the sight of Man could endure) being clothed with shyning vestements, and standing round about the Altar, and bowing downe their heads in such sort, as if one should behould*

shoul-

shoulders bearing thẽselues in the presence of their King. Thus farre *S. Chrysostome.* The truth of which narration I do not so much vrge (since I presume our Aduersaries will esteme it as fabulous) but I vrge, that *S. Chrysostome* thought it to be true (since otherwise he would neuer haue recorded it) and consequently, that he belieued, that Angells were truly, and really present at the Altar during the tyme of the celebration of the Eucharist.

In like sort, *Homil. 41. in priorem ad Corinth. Non frustra memoriam mortuorum inter sacra mysteria celebramus, aut accedimus, pro istis Agnum illum iacentem, & peccata mundi tollentem deprecantes.* We do not in vayne celebrate the memory of the dead at the Diuine Mysteries; neither doe we in vayne approach, beseeching that Lambe there lying for them, & taking away the sinnes of the World.] which wordes imply manifestly, that the Eucharist was in his tyme inuoked.

The same Father, *Homil. 60. ad Pop. Antiochenum. Non sufficit &c. He could not be contented to become Man, to be beaten in the meane while with wands, but he doth bring vs into one masse (as I may say) with himselfe: Neither* fide solùm, sed reipsa, *by faith only, but in very deed, he hath made vs his Body.*] In which place, we find the very distinction inuented by our Aduersaries to be excluded by *S. Chrysostome.*

In like manner, *Homil. 61. ad Popul. Antiochenum*, he affirmeth, that Christs Flesh by meanes of this Sacrament is mingled with ours, not only by Charity, but *reipsa*, in very deed. See him also *Homil. 24. in priorem ad Corinth.* where he saith, that we are so vnited to the Body of Christ by the Eucharist, as his Body was vnited to the word by the Incarnation, to wit, truly, and really, and

not figuratiuely; but all these sayings of *Chrysostome* were very idle, if we receaued Christ only in a signe, and by representation.

S. Gregory Nazianzen Orat. de obitu Gorgoniæ Sororis eius, thus writeth: *Ad altare cum fide procumbit; eum, qui super illud colitur, magno cum clamore obtestans*. She (*viz. Gorgonia*) did prostrate herselfe before the Altar with faith, praying to him with great clamour, who is worshipped vpon the said Altar.] But *Gorgonia* prayed not to Bread, or Wine. Which action of hers (as she acknowledging therby the true presence of Christs Body, and Bloud vpon the Altar) is much reprehended by *Peter Martyr l. contra Gardinerum, obiect.* 38. saying: that she was not well instructed in Christian Religion; so far different was his iudgment from the iudgment of *S. Gregory* heerin: but of this place more heerafter.

S. Gregory Nyssene, Orat. Catechetica c. 36. *&* 37. among other things thus writeth: *Quemadmodum parum fermenti* &c. *Euen as a little Leauen doth make the whole masse like to it selfe; so that body which is made immortall by God, entring into our Body, doth transferre, and change it into it selfe.*] And after: *Fidelium corporibus* &c. *That Body is ioyned with the bodyes of the faithfull, that by that coniunction with the Immortall Body, Man may be made partaker of Immortality.*

S. Ambrose, l. 1. *in Lucam*, expounding those words, *Apparuit illi Angelus*, thus writeth: *Non dubites assistere Angelum, quando Christus assistit, Christus immolatur*. Do not doubt, but that an Angell is there present, when Christ is there present, when Christ is sacrificed.]

The same Father *l.* 3. *de Spiritu sancto c.* 12. expounding those wordes of the *Psalm*. 98. *Adorate scabellum pedum*

dum eius, thus writeth: *Itaq; per scabellum terra &c. Therfore by the Footstoole the Earth is vnderstood, & by the earth, the Flesh of Christ, which we now do adore in the Mysteries, and which the Apostles adored in our Lord Iesus, as we haue said before.*] Where he saith, that the Flesh of Christ (being vnited with the Word) is adored by vs in the Mysteries, that is, in the Eucharist.

S. Cyril of *Ierusalem* thus writeth: *Sic Christophori erimus, id est, Christum ferentes &c. So shall we be* Christophori, *that is Men bearing Christ, when we shall receaue his Body, and Bloud into our Members, and as* S. Peter *saith: We shall be made Partakers of the diuine Nature.*]

S. Hilarius l. 8. de Trinitate: Si enim verè verbum &c. For if the Word be truly made Flesh, & we truly take the Word made Flesh, in our Lords meate, how can he not be thought to remaine naturally in vs.] And in the same place he also saith: *De naturali in nobis Christi veritate &c. Of the naturall verity of Christ in vs, whatsoeuer we speake, we speake foolishly, and wickedly, except we learne of him, for it is he, that said:* Caro mea verè est esca.

Origen Homil. 13. in Exod. expounding the 21. Chapter of that Booke, saith: *Volo vos admonere religionis vestræ exemplis; nostis, qui diuinis mysterijs interesse consueuistis, quemodo, cum suscipitis Corpus Domini, cum omni cautela, & veneratione seruatis, ne ex eo parum quid decidat, ne consecrati muneris aliquid dilabatur; reos enim vos creditis, & certè creditis, si quid inde per negligentiam decidat.* I will admonish you by the examples of your Religion: You know well, who haue bene accustomed to be present at the diuine Mysteries, how when you take the body of Christ you obserue with all warinesse, and veneration, that no part of the consecrated Gift do fall downe, for you beleeue

them to be guilty (and you beleeue truly) if any parcell thereof doe fall downe through negligence.

Tertullian lib. de Corona Militis, speaking of diuers Christian Rites: *Calicis, aut Panis etiam nostri &c. We doe suffer with griefe, that any part of our Cup, or bread should fall vpon the Earth.*]

S. Irenæus l. 8. contra Hæres. c. 34. Quomodo autem rursus dicunt. &c. How doe they say againe, that the Flesh commeth into corruption, and receaueth not lyfe, which is nourished of the body, and bloud of our Lord?] Where he maketh the receauing of the Eucharist to be a Pledge of our Resurrection, and Immortality.

S. Pius the first Bishop of *Rome* of that name, did set downe certaine seuere punishmẽts for such, by whose negligence any part of the Body, or Bloud of our Lord did fall vpon the ground, yea, or vpon the Altar, commanding the place to be licked with the tongue, & to be scraped. But if the Eucharist were not the true Body of Christ, but only by representation, there were no reason, why there should be greater diligence giuen to preuent, that no part thereof doe fall vpon the ground, then there was, that the water of Baptisme, the Images of Christ, or the Holy Bible should not fall vpon the ground. His Decree touching the former point appeareth out of *Gratian de Consecrat. distinct. 2. Can.* Si per negligentiam &c.

S. Dionysius Areopagita lib. de Hierarchia Ecclesiast. c. 3. part. 3. thus speaketh to the Blessed Eucharist. *O Diuinissimum, & Sacrosanctum Sacramentũ obducta tibi significantium signorum operimenta dignanter aperi; & perspicuè nobis fac appareas; nostrosq; spirituales oculos singulari, & aperta tua lucis fulgore imple.* O most Diuine, and most holy Sacament, vouchsafe to remoouе from thee the veyles, or couerings

of those signifying signes, & appeare to vs perspicuously, and fill our spirituall Eyes with a singular, and cleare resplendency of thy Light,] Heere it cannot be said, that he did so inuoke the bread, because such Inuocation were most ridiculous. Neither can it be said, that *Dionysius* did make an Apostrophe, or Chang of speach, from the Symboles of the Eucharist to Christ signified therby, inuoking Christ before the Symboles: for heere *Dyonisius* doth not inuoke Christ, as he is in Heauen, but inuokes the Sacrament it selfe, and demandeth of it such things, as are to be obtayned of God alone. Add hereto that the ground of this Answere doth warrant the Catholikes praying before Images, for if a man may pray to Christ before the Symboles of his Body, by the same reason may he pray to him before his Image.

The said Father also in the former booke, thus further writeth: *Pontifex, quòd Hostiam salutarem* &c. *The Priest when he sacrificeth the healthfull Hoast, which is aboue him, doth excuse himselfe, speaking to it:* Tu dixisti, Hoc facite *&c. Thou hast said, Doe you this* &c.] But the Bread is not aboue vs, neither is there more reason, that we should excuse our selues for handling the Bread, then for handling the Water of Baptisme; or other sacred things belonging to our Christian Faith. Such was the reuerence of this most ancient Father (for he liued in the time of the Apostles) towardes the blessed Sacrament. And though our Aduersaries do impudently maintayne, that this booke was not written by the said *Dyonisius*, yet others of them do acknowledge at least, that it is the worke of a most ancient Father, yea *Peter Martyr* prizeth this booke, as he is not affraid to wrest a place of the said worke, for the defence of his Heresie heerin. Now,

that the Author of this worke is most ancient, it appeareth from this one consideration, to wit, that the Author therof is cited for an ancient, and reuerend Father by *S. Gregorie, Homil. 34. in Euangel.* but if *S. Gregory*, who lined aboue a thousand yeares since, did account this Author for an Ancient, and Venerable Father, then what estimation of him ought we to haue?

(a) *Diuinæ &c.*] 2. Pet. 1.
(b) *She who liueth.*] 1. Tim. 5.
(c) *One Father.*] Chrysost., homil. 21. in Act. Apostol.

OF

OF THEIR TESTIMONIES SHEWING

That the Celebration of the Eucharist, contayneth a proper, and true Sacrifice.

CHAP. VII.

THE last Branch of Authorities shall be deduced from the common Doctrine of the Fathers, which teacheth, that when our Sauiour had in place of the disobedient, and degenerating Iewes adopted vs Gentiles, that euen out of a more then Seraphical, & burning charitie towards vs, he was content before his death to bequeath to his Church the true Sacrifice of himselfe, there to be daily offered vp vnder the formes of Bread, and Wine. The which was (according to the (a) *Psalmist*) so long afore shaddowed by that of *Melchisedech*, whereof one (b) Father with reference therunto saith: *Videns Typum*

Typum, cogita (oro) & veritatem: and of which (by reason of it perpetuall continuance to be in the Church) the once Glory, and Pride of *Africke* thus writeth: (c) *Perpes est hoc Sacrificium, & semper permanens Holocaustum.*

Now heere it will not seeme needfull to alledge the Authorities of the Fathers (though most frequent, and punctuall therein) expounding the Sacrifice of *Melchisedech* as a Type of the Eucharist, therefore (for greater breuity) I will content my selfe in laying downe the Sentences, and Iudgement of the said Doctours, wherein they plainly acknowledge, that the Eucharist doth conteine in it selfe a Sacrifice, not in a forced, and Metaphoricall, but in a true, and natiue acception of the Word. And yet for the more cleere conuincing of our Aduersaries herein, I will forbeare all Inferentiall Deductions drawne by long circuitions, and ambages of Sequeles, and will tye my selfe only to such their sayings, wherein we find the Eucharist to be called *Sacrificium*, *Victima* &c. or where the words, *Immolare*, *Offerre*, and the like; are said of the Eucharist; or finally where the word, *Altare*, is expressely mentioned, which word (euen by the confession of *Doctour* (d) *Reynolds*) necessarily implyeth a true Sacrifice. Which point being once cleared, we shall thereby more easily discouer the malice of our Sectaryes against Gods Church, since they labour to wound her in the Maister-veyne of Christian Religion, by depriuing her of the most auayleable, & healthfull Oblation of Christs Body, and Bloud, left for the better expiating of Mans sinnes. Which Mysterie of our Catholike Faith these new Brethren are loth to acknowledge, in that (besides other Reasons) it comprehendeth, as being a Sacrifice, no small difficulties. For it

is a Sacrifice remitting our Sinnes, where no Bloud (e) is shed, and yet without (f) shedding of Bloud there is no remission: or if bloud be heere shed, yet in an incruent, and vnbloudy manner. Where what is heere sacrificed remaines (g) inconsumptible, and yet euery such true Litation necessarily implyes a consumption, and destroying of the thing sacrificed. Where Innocency assayles Iniquity; and to preuent the punishment of God for the sinne of Man, both God (h) & Man are vpon the Altar: Where the holy thing was but once to be immolated (i), and yet was commaunded to be often immolated: Where being a true Sacrifice, is yet (according to the (k) Apostle) a Commemoration of a true Sacrifice: Where that, which descended from (l) God to Man, is offered vp by Man to God: Where the (m) Creator by meanes thereof vouchsafeth to be contayned within his Creature; and the Supreme Agent within his Myniſteriall Agent: Where (as one Father saith, (n) *Idem est Conuiua, & Conuiuium; idem comedens, & qui comeditur*. And (as another teacheth) where one and the same body is borne vp by the hands of the said body; *Ferebatur* (o) *Christus in manibus suis*: So the hands became the Altar, whereupon the Body was sacrificed: Finally, where the Priest is become the Sacrifice, according to that Father: *Caro sacrificij nostri corpus est effectum Sacerdotis nostri*.

But to leaue these subtilties; Heere we are to aduertise the Reader, that the Fathers teaching the Eucharist to comprehend in it selfe a true Sacrifice: This their doctrine cannot be applyed to Bread, and Wine. First, because the Sacrifice of Bread, and Wine either in respect of the naturall Substances of the things themselues, or their significations, and representations, is inferiour to

the Sacrifice of the Old Law (as appeareth aboue in the Figures of the Eucharist.) And secondly, in that the Fathers do ascribe an infinite vertue to the Sacrifice heere made (of the power wherof we haue entreated in the former precedent Chapter) but no such imputatiue efficacy can with any probability be assigned (especially now in the time of Grace) to the sacrificing of a little Bread, & Wine: Thus according to the Fathers, what to a vulgar Eye heere seemes to be offered vp, is not: and what is, seemes not.

And now to proceed to these their Testimonies: First we read (besides those few places already alleaged, though ranged to some one of the former heads, in regard of the particuler respect there specified) in *S. Leo, serm. 8. de Passione*, and *in S. Cyril l. de Adoratione in spiritu, & veritate*: That the Body of our Sauiour is offered vp as a sacrifice in the Mysterie of the Eucharist.

[*S. Augustine l. 4. de Trinitate, c. 14. Quid gratius offeri, aut susci pi posset, quàm Caro Sacrificij nostri Corpus effectum Sacerdotis nostri?* What can be offered vp, or accepted more thankfully, then that the Flesh of our Sacrifice should become the Body of our Priest?]

The same Father *l. 2. quæst. Euangel. q. 3.* shewing, why Christ commaunded the Leprous Man to offer vp Sacrifice for his clensing, thus writeth: *Quia nondum institutum erat &c. Because as yet this Sacrifice (being the Holy of Holies) which is his Body, was not as yet ordayned.*] The said Father *lib. de Ciuit. Dei 8. c. vlt. & l. 22. c. 8.* maketh frequent mention of Altars.

S. Chrysostome l. 6. De Sacerdotio. Per id tempus, & Angeli Sacerdoti assident, & cælestium potestatum vniuersus ardo clamores excitat, & locus Altari victimus in illius honorem,

qui

qui immolatur, Angelorum choris plenus est; id quod credere dunde licet, vel ex tanto illo Sacrificio, quod tunc peragitur: At that time the Angells draw neere to the Priest, & the whole Order of the Heauenly Powers causeth great voyces, and the place neere to the Altar, by reason of the honour of him (who is there immolated) is full of Angells; which thing we may fully belieue in regard of so great a sacrifice there performed.]

Againe, *Homil. 17. in Epist. ad Hebraos. In multis locis &c. In many places are offered not diuers Christs, but one only Christ euery where, remayning entire both here, & there, being but one Body, not many Bodyes.*] And, *Homil. 24. in priorem ad Corinth.* he saith: *Pro victimarum &c. He hath commaunded himselfe to be offered vp in place of the slaughter of sheep, and such like Sacrifices.*] And, *Homil. 53. ad Populum: Si quis vellet &c. If any should endeauour to destroy this Altar, would not you destroy, and kill him with stones?*] And, *Homil. 20. in 2. epist. ad Corinth. Tu Altare honoras &c. Thou doest honour the Altar, which receaueth vpō it the Body of Christ.*]

S. Gregory Nyssene, Orat. de Resurrect. Dominus praeoccupans impetum Iudæorum &c. Our Lord preuenting the violence of the Iewes (being both Priest, and Lambe) made himselfe a Sacrifice. But thou demaundest of me, when this did happen? Euen then, when he gaue to his Disciples his Body to eate, and his Bloud to drinke.

S. Ambrose in cap. 1. Luce. Cum sacrificamus &c. When we do sacrifice, Christ is present, Christ is immolated.] And, *in Psalm. 38. Etsi nunc Christus non videatur offerre, ipse tamē offertur in terris, cum corpus eius offertur.* Although Christ may be thought now not to offer, notwithstanding he is offered heere vpon Earth, when his Body is offered.]

fered.]

Optatus Milcuitanus l. 6. contra Parmenianum, thus writeth: *Quid est enim tam sacrilegium, quàm Altaria Dei, (in quibus aliquando vos obtulistis) frangere, radere, & remouere? in quibus vota populi & membra Christi portata sunt? quo Deus Omnipotens sit? quo postulatus descendit spiritus Sanctus? vnde à multis pignus aeternæ salutis, & tutela fidei, & spes resurrectionis accepta est?* What is more sacrilegious, then to breake, to scrape, to remoue the Altars of God vpon the which your selues sometymes haue offered? In the which the Vowes of the People, and the Members of Christ are borne? where God (who is Omnipotent) is called vpon? whereupon the Holy Ghost (being prayed vnto) descendeth? from whence the Pledge of eternall Saluation, and the defence of fayth, and hope of the Resurrection is taken.] And a little after: *Quid est Altare &c. What is the Altar, but the seate of the Body, and Bloud of Christ?*] And againe: *Quid vos offenderat Christus &c. In what hath Christ offended you, whose Body, and Bloud doth there stay by certaine tymes?*] And againe after, *Hoc tamen immane &c. Notwithstanding this cruell, and heynous offence is performed, whensoeuer you haue broken the Chalices, which are the Porters, or Carryers of the bloud of Christ.*] *Eusebius l. 1. demon. Euang. c. 6.* writeth much concerning Altars in the time of the Ghospell.

S. Cyprian l. 1. ep. 9. speaking of a certaine Priest deceased, who for leauing of a temporall, and worldly prohibited businesse to be performed by another Priest, deserued not (according to *Cyprians* Iudgement) to haue the sacrifice offered for him, because (saith he) he did withdraw the Priest of God from the Altar.

Tertullian lib. de Pœnitentia mentioneth kneeling be-

fore the Altars of God.

Dionysius Areopagita c. 3. Eccles. Hierarch. makes mention of Altars.

Hippolytus Martyr Orat. de Antichristo, bringeth in Christ thus speaking: *Venite Pontifices, & Sacerdotes, qui pretiosum corpus, & Sanguinem meum quotidie immolastis.* [Come hither yee High Priests, and other Priests, who dayly doe sacrifice my precious body, and bloud.]

In the Canons of the Apostles (viz. 3. & 4.) there is frequent speach touching Altars.

Lastly S. *Andrew* the Apostle (as his Disciples do write in his Passion) thus saith: *Ego Omnipotenti Deo immaculatum Agnum quotidie sacrificio &c. Qui cùm sit verè sacrificatus, & verè à populo carnis eius manducata, integer perseverat, & vivus.* [I doe dayly sacrifice vnto Almighty God the immaculate Lambe. Who, when he is truly sacrificed; and his flesh truly eaten of the People, doth nevertheless perseuere whole, and aliue.]

Thus haue I gone ouer certaine principall Heads, carrying in themselues a naturall dependency (like the foure Beasts in *Ezechiel*, which were ioyned one to another by their wings) wherin is conteyned a short *Compendium* of the Fathers writings in this Point; out of which abstract, we may easily extract their Faith, and Belefe had in this high Mysterie, and withall conclude, that the Sacramentaries are no more distant, & remote from the Times, wherin the Fathers liued, then from the Doctrine maintayned in the said Tymes. For (as we haue shewed) the Fathers not contenting themselues with ordinary positiue, and measured speaches deliuered of the Eucharist, do vse high, and superlatiue Titles of the dignity, and worth therof: The Sacramentaries only afford such ap-

pellations, as Nature hath already giuen to the same. The Fathers acknowledging heerin a true, and reall Change, haue paralelled it with the greatest supernaturall Chages whatsoeuer: The Sacramentaries can find no other alteration, but that afore it being common Bread, & Wine, is now only reserued (a strange, and stupendious Mutation) for the vse of their Winy Communion.

The Fathers postpose the Types of the Old Law to it, yea compare it with the chiefest Articles of Christian Faith: The Sacramentaries as long as they teach, that it but Typically represeteth the Body, & Bloud of Christ, can at the most but prize it at the equall valew of those Legall Figures.

The Fathers ascribed the Cõuersion there made, only to the Omnipotency of God, affirming, that not sense, but only Faith is able to conceaue the Mysteries therin: The Sacramentaries (for the more cõtenancing of their Bread, and Wine) verbally somtymes acknowledge, that a liuely Faith only is of force to apprehend the difficulties of these their representing Elements. O the penetrating Faith of our Sectaries! the worke (no doubt) of the Holy Ghost! the seed of *Abraham*, able (according to the Apostle) to moue Mountaines, transcending the narrow, and niggard Limits of Sense, and Reason, since it is of power (most supernaturally) to apprehend, how one thing may represent, and signify another thing! But to passe on.

The Fathers do attribute euen most diuine, and celestiall effects to this Sacrament: The Sacramentaries, what efficacy they assigne therunto (to wit, the apprehending of Christ by Faith) do teach, that it riseth only from the signification, and remembrance of Christ

implyed in the externall Signes, the which may as availably (euen by their owne Principles) be performed by any of their ten-shilling-Sermons.

The Fathers exhibited with great humility all due reuerẽce, & adoratiõ to Christs Body there present: The Sacramentaries cannot be induced to giue any such respect at all. Finally, the Fathers do maintayne, that the Eucharist is a true, and Propitiatory Oblation: The Sacramentaries acknowledge no other Oblation in the Church, then only a spirituall Sacrifice of Prayer, and Thanksgiuing.

Thus we see, what Alienation there is betweene the Writings of the Fathers, and of our Nouellists. But we are not to meruaile, that the Sacramentaries doe neuer speake in one, and the same Catholike Idiome with those Primitiue Doctours, since they are deafe heerin, and will not be brought to heare, what the Church of God, either in those ancient Tymes, or in these latter dayes do teach concerning the same; And we know, it is a Conclusion in Philosophy, that, *He who neuer heareth, neuer speaketh.*

But before I conclude this Point, I will put the Reader in remembrance of some other Obseruations contayned in the Testimonyes of the Fathers, which may at least morally assure him, that they maintayned our Catholike doctrine of the Eucharist: Most of which Obseruations (though different from the foresaid heads) are to be found in their former alleaged Authorities: Others of them in other their Sentences: Of both which for aduantaging the Readers memory, and for auoyding a wearisome prolixity, I will only referre him to the places, where such their Sentences may be read.

As first we find, that the Fathers resting vpon the doctrine

doctrine of the Reall Presence, as a confessed Article of Christian Faith, did from thence, as from an acknowledged Principle refell diuers Heresyes. Thus did (a) *Irenæus* against the *Valentinians*, proue from this Mystery, that Christ was the Sonne of God the Father; which Doctour also proueth from the same ground the resurrection of the flesh, giuing a reason thereof in these words: *Quoniam* (b) *corpore & sanguine Domini alitur*. In lyke sort he proueth against the (c) *Gnostici*, that Christ came in true flesh, euen from the former dogmaticall point of the Eucharist. After the same manner (d) *Hilarius* proueth, that Christ had a true Body and Bloud, in that his true flesh and bloud was in this Sacrament. Finally *Cyril* of *Alexandria* (e) teacheth against the *Arian*, that Christ both according to his *Diuinity*, and *Humanity* did exercise his influence vpon vs, in that his Body and Bloud was taken in the Eucharist to nourish in vs a spirituall lyfe.

Secondly they acknowledge a great miracle to rest, that Christ as being in the Eucharist, is in diuers seuerall places at one and the same tyme. Thus doth (f) *Chrysostome*, (g) *Basil*, and *Gregory* (h) *Nyssene*.

Thirdly they assigne a reason, why Christ would latently be vnder the formes of bread and wyne, to wit, lest otherwise the Communicants should receaue his body with horrour and feare: So (i) *Ambrose*, (k) *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and (l) *Theophilact* doe teach.

Fourthly they affirme, that Christ, as he is taken in the Eucahrist, is neither corrupted nor diminished, placing a great difficulty therin, as we find out of (m) *S. Andrew*. The lyke we read in (n) *Cyprian* (o), *Augustine*, and *Cyril* (p) of *Ierusalem*. But this difficulty were idly suggested, if Christ were in the Sacrament only in re-

presen-

presentation.

Fifthly, they teach, that the Vnion of Christ with vs in the Sacrament is not only spirituall, and *fide tantum*, but *reipsa*, in very deed and truely. This is affirmed by (q) *Hilarius*, and (r) *Chrysostome*. Yea they further proceed, writing, that this spirituall Vnion which is made through fayth and grace, doth ryse from the corporall Vnion of Christ with vs, as the Effect procedeth from the Cause; so (s) *Cyril*, and (t) *Tertullian*.

Sixtly, they mantayne, that the Body of Christ is truly taken, aswell by the wicked, as the vertuous and godly, meere contrary to the doctrine of the Sacramentaries, who affirme, that Christs Body (because it is in the Sacrament only Typically) is only taken by the faithfull. Yea the Fathers are not affraid to say, that his Body is receaued by the wicked *ore sacrilego*, with a sacrilegious mouth, so distinguishing this kind of receauing, from a spirituall and fruitfull receauing. See heerof (u) *Augustine*, (x) *Chrysostome*, (y) *Origen*, (z) *Cyprian*, and (a) *Basil*.

Seauenthly they do teach, that Christ at his last Supper did eate his owne Body. Thus (b) *Chrysostome*, and (c) *Hierome*. But this cannot probably be vnderstood according to the *Caluinian* participation through Grace and faith, since no new accession, or increase of Grace came to Christ after the very first moment of his Incarnation. Besides it is most absurd to say, that the Flesh of Christ is the instrumentall cause of the Grace giuen to Christ.

Eightly, and lastly, they intimate diuers things touching the *Praxis*, and vse of the Blessed Euchariſt, which are altogether incompetent to a Typicall and figuratiue

Presence. As first (to omit the *Adoration* and *Inuocation* of the Eucharist, already entreated of) they did place a great religious act in taking this Sacrament fasting: as (d) *Augustine*, and *Chrysostome* do witnes: yea (e) *Chrysostome* affirmeth it to be a sinne to take it not fasting. They also affirmed that a most diligent examining of our Conscience ought to precede the participation therof: So (f) *Chrysostome*. They cõmaunded that it should not be seene of such as were Infidels: So (g) *Dionysius*; and which is more that it should not be seene of the faithfull yet vnbaptized, as appeareth out of (h) *Augustine*. Hence it is that in the presence of the misbelieuing Infidels they vsed most secret and cautelous phrases, speaking of the Eucharist, as *Sacramentum fidelium norunt Fideles*: So (i) *Augustine*. And, *Norunt, qui mysterijs imbuti sunt*. So (k) *Origen*. They taught that in extremity of sicknes it was to be taken of euery Christian *pro Viatico*, as appeareth out of the first Councell of (l) *Nyce*, (m) *Eusebius*, and (n) *Chrysostome*. Finally, hither may be referred, what the Fathers of the Primitiue Church do teach touching the sanctity of Temples, Vestments, Chalices, and other religious Vessels, all vsed in the celebration of the Eucharist; All which things, as (o) *Hierome* saith, *propter consortium corporis & sanguinis Domini magna veneratione celantur*. And (p) *Optatus* writeth, that they being *contaminata*, *Sacrilegos fasiunt*. And hence it riseth, that it was obiected to the *Arians* by *Athanasius*, that, *fregerunt mysticum Calicem*, which offence was acknowledged to be most heynous by the *Councell* of *Alexandria*, as (q) *Athanasius* writeth. To the same end (to wit, as tending to the sacred function of consecrating the Eucharist) may be referred what the Fathers haue written of the Dignity of

Priest-

Priesthood: Of which point entreates (r) *Nazianzen*, (s) *Chrysostome*, and others; as also of their vowed (t) Chastity, principally directed for that purpose.

Now, who shall weigh all these seuerall Obseruations, accompanyed with the former heads set downe at large, and all litterally, and plainly expressed in the Fathers Writings; and not any one of them sorting in nature to a bare Typicall Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but all most sutable & agreeable to the worth of his true and reall being there, how can he be otherwise perswaded, then that those Doctours did iointly agree with vs in this high Article of faith? Wherfore the determination of this matter (to wit, whether the Fathers were Sacramētaries, or Catholikes heerin) I remit not so much to the censure of the Learned (for this were to wrong their Iudgments, in making a Point so euident, the Obiect of their graue Resolutions) as I referre it, euen to the fyue Senses of the ignorant and illiterate.

(a) *The Psalmist.*] Psal. 109. in these words: *Iurauit Dominus, & non pœnitebit eum: Tu es Sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech.*

(b) *One Father.*] viz. *Chrysostome homil. 33. in Genes.*

(c) *Perpes est hoc.*] *Cyprian Sermone de Cœna Domini.*

(d) *Doctor Reynolds.*] viz. in his Conference with *M. Hart.* pag. 551.

(e) *No Blould is shed.*] Christs Bloud was to be shed in a bloudy manner but once, in that he was but once to dye, according to that *Heb. 9. Christ was offered once to take away the sinnes of many.* And from his Passion the Sacrifice of the Eucharist receaues it vertue, and force, And therefore in this sense Sins may be said to be remitted in the Eucharist by sheding of bloud. Besides Christs bloud is truly shed (though in an vnbloudy manner) in the Sacrifice of the Masse, through the worth wherof our Sinns are remitted.

(f) *Without shedding of Blood.*] Heb. c. 9.

(g) *Remaynes inconsumptible.*] Christs Body in the Sacrifice of the Masse remaines inconsumptible, in that it being glorified, is impatible, and not capable of any such alteration, or change. And yet his Body, as it is a Sacrifice may be said in some sense to be consumptible, in that by the reason of the receauing, and eating of it, it ceaseth to be vnder the formes of Bread, and Wyne, and consequently ceaseth to be that (to wit, to lye vnder those formes) which afore it was. Now that there should be a Transmutation, and change of the thing sacrificed, is apparent, in that it is one particle in the definition of a true Sacrifice, as also the same appeareth by the example of all the Sacrifices in the Old Law.

(h) *God and Man.*] In that Christs Body is vpon the Altar, and that his Humanity is neuer more to be seuered from his Diuinity: therfore it followeth that his Diuinity is there present with his Humanity, as in the first Tract is fully demonstrated.

(i) *Once to be immolated.*] To wit, in a bloudy manner, and this was performed but once, *viz.* at the time of his Passion: And yet he is often to be sacrificed in the Eucharist, in that himselfe saith, *Hoc facite.*

(k) *According to the Apostle.*] *Viz.* 1. Cor. 11. in these words: *Mortem Domini annunciabitis, donec veniat.*

(l) *Descended from God to man.*] The Eucharist, as it is a Sacrament, that is, an externall signe of an inuisible Grace, and refection, which is conferred to vs, whilest we take the Eucharist aright; so it proceedeth from God (as all Sacraments doe) but as the Body of Christ is there sacrificed vp by the Priest, so according to the nature of a Sacrifice, it is offered by him to God.

(m) *The Creatour.*] In that the Priest receauing the Body of Christ, his body is there accompanied with the Diuinity of Christ, as is said aboue.

(n) *Idem est Conuiua &c.*] S. *Hierome Epist. ad Hedibiam quæst.* 2.

(o) *Perebatur Christus.*] So writeth S. *Augustine in Psal.* 33. *concion.* 1.

(a) *Irenæus.*] l. 4. c. 34.

(b) *Quoniam corpore.*] Irenæus ibidem.

(c) *Gnostici.*] l. 5 c. 2.

(d) *Hilarius.*] l. 8. de Trinitate.

(e) *Cyrillus.*] l. 10 in Ioan. c. 13.

(f) *Chrysostome.*] l. 3. de Sacerdot.

(g) *Basil.*] in Liturgia.

(h) *Nyssenus*

(h) *Nyssenus.*] Orat. de Paschate.
(i) *Ambrose.*] l. 4. de Sacramentis,
(k) *Cyril.*] apud D. *Thomam*, in Catena, circa caput 22. Lucæ.
(l) *Theophilact.*] in c. 26. *Matthæi.*
(m) *S. Andrew.*] In his Passion written by his Disciples.
(n) *Cyprian.*] Sermone de *Cœna Domini.*
(o) *Augustine.*] Serm. 2 *de verbis Apostoli.*
(p) *Cyril.*] Catech. 5. Myst.
(q) *Hilarius.*] l. 8. de Trinitate.
(r) *Chrysostome.*] homil. 45. in Ioan. & 83. in Matth.
(s) *Cyril.*] l. 4. in Ioan. c. 14. & 15.
(t) *Tertullian.*] l. de resurrect Carnis.
(u) *Augustine.*] tract. 27. in Ioan. & l. 5. de Baptismo contra Donat. c. 8.
(x) *Chrysostome.*] homil. 83. in Matthæum.
(y) *Origen.*] in Psal. 37.
(z) *Cyprian.*] l. 3. epist. 15.
(a) *Basil.*] l. 2. de *Baptismo* c. 3.
(b) *Chrysostome.*] *Homil. 83. in Matth.*
(c) *Hierome.*] *In Hedibiam.*
(d) *Augustine.*] epist. 118.
(e) *Chrysostome.*] Epist. 3. ad *Ciriacum.*
(f) *Chrysostome.*] l. 6. de *Sacerdotio.*
(g) *Dionysius.*] Cap. 7. *Eccles. Hierarch.*
(h) *Augustine.*] Tract. 11. in *Ioan.*
(i) *Augustine.*] Serm. 2. de *verbis Apostol.*
(k) *Origen.*] Homil. 13 in *Exodum.* & 9. in *Leviticum.*
(l) *Councell of Nyce.*] Canon. 12.
(m) *Eusebius.*] l. 6. c. 34.
(n) *Chrysostome.*] l. 6. de *Sacerdot.*
(o) *Hierome.*] Ad *Theophilum Alexand.*
(p) *Optatus.*] l. 6. *contra Parmenianum.*
(q) *Athanasius.*] Apologia 2.
(r) *Nazianzen.*] Apolog. 2. & *Orationes ad Iulianum.*
(s) *Chrysostome.*] Lib. *de Sacerdot.*
(t) *Vowed Chastity.*] Of which point do occur most frequent Authorityes in the wrytings of the Fathers.

OF THE DIVERS MANNERS

of the Proteſtants Euaſions to the Authorities of the Fathers.

CHAP. VIII.

ALTHOVGH in ſetting downe the Authorities of the Fathers in the precedent Chapters, I haue illuſtrated moſt of thē with ſuch ſhort Animaduerſions, as beſt vnfould the true Senſe of the ſaid Authorities, & conſequently preuent all ſuch ſleighty eluſions, as are vſed by our Aduerſaries for the auoyding of the ſame: Neuertheleſſe I haue thought good heere to amaſſe togeather all their diuers kinds of Anſweres, being ſeuerally applyed in generall to the produced ſayings of the former chief Heads (for cōmonly to all Teſtimonies

ſtimonies of one Nature, they do appropriate one, & the ſame Anſwere.) Thus ſhall the diſcreet Reader haue at once a *Synopſis*, or entire view of the Sacramentaries feeble euaſions, being full of tergiuerſation, and diſtruſt.

Now then, one Kind of their Anſwers (if ſo I may terme it) is to giue no anſwere at all; for when they are preſſed with ſuch perſpicuous, and euident places of the Fathers, as are in no ſort to be obſcured with any myſt of words (for the Sunne is ſometimes ſo radiant, as that it cannot be ouerclouded) then in their Replyes to Catholike Bookes therin, they are content, not taking notice therof (like men of good natures) to ſuffer all ſuch ſentences quietly to paſſe by them in Gods name, & the Kings. Thus we find moſt cleere paſſages of the Fathers ſet downe in Catholike Bookes, yet neuer anſwered by *Caluin*, *Peter Martyr*, or others, who haue vndertaken a refutation of the ſaid Bookes, but altogeather paſſed ouer, as if no ſuch places had bene obiected: Such carefull Pylotes they are, as willing to auoyd the moſt dangerous Rocks. Which courſe of theirs I cānot condemne as impoliticke, ſince it is leſſe diſaduantagious ſilently to giue way to all ſuch Aſſertions, then by oppoſition to diſplay openly the forces of the ſame; for we ſee, that the ſtrength of the Wind is beſt diſcerned by finding reſiſtance.

Of the many Authorities of the Fathers, wherunto the Proteſtants (to wit *Caluin*, *Peter Martyr* &c.) giue no Anſwere at all, I haue thought good to note theſe few, viz. *The Paſſion of S. Andrew. Origen homil. 13. in Exod. in c. 25. & hom. 5 in diuerſa loca Euangelij. Cyril Catech. 4. Myſtagog. Gregorie Nyſſene Orat. Catechet. c. 36. & 37. Ephrē lib. de natura Dei minimè ſcrutanda. Gaudentius Tract. 2.*

de

de Exodo. Chrysostome Homil. 83. in Matth. & 51. in Matth. & Homil. 21. in Act. & Homil. de Eucharist. in Enæniis. & lib. 6. de Sacerdotio. Proclus Constantinopolitanus lib. de Traditione diuinæ Liturgiæ: besides many other Testimonies of these, and other Fathers.

The first forme then of their Positiue Answers may be assigned to those Authorityes, wherin the Fathers doe absolutely call the Eucharist, the Body, and Bloud of Christ; as where they teach, that we doe eate his Body, and drinke his Bloud, or that the Body, and Bloud, which we receaue in the Eucharist is our pryce, the Pledge of our Saluation, or the like.

To the Testimonyes of this Nature, our Aduersaries do shape a double Answere. For either they vnderstand those places of the True Body, and Bloud of Christ, as it is in Heauen, and receaued by vs by faith; or else of the signes thereof, which we truly, and really doe take in the Eucharist. But if we doe obserue intensly, and deliberately the circumstances of those Passages, it will be euident, that neither part of this Answere is in any sort satisfactory.

For first, that the Fathers meaning is not, that we take his Body (as it is in Heauen) by faith, is proued, in that you shall for the most part euer find, that in such places they teach, that we receaue it from the Altar, or at the Priests hands (and consequently not as it is in Heauen) or that the Sacrament of the Eucharist is his Body, and Bloud: or finally you shall find there some other such like accession of Words, as doe force the Place to be interpreted of his Body, and Bloud, as it is vnder the externall formes, and not as it is in Heauen.

And as touching the second Branch of their former Euasion,

Euasion, to wit, that the said Testimonyes are not to be interpreted of the Bread, and Wyne signifying, and figuring his Body, & Bloud, in which they say Christs Body is symbolically taken, is no lesse manifest; the reason whereof being this: Because the words of those Testimonyes doe almost euer intimate some effect, or efficacy of the Eucharist, which to Bread, and Wyne is incompetent; as that it nourisheth our Soules, or that it is the Price, or Pledge of our Saluation, or hope of our Resurrection, or that it suffered for our Sinnes, or some other such spirituall worke, energy, or operation, whereof the bare Symboles of the Eucharist are not capable.

Thus may the obseruant Reader cleerely discerne the feeblenes of this their Answere, and conclude with himselfe, that such Testimonyes of the Fathers cannot be construed of Christs Body, as it is in Heauen; since the Words precedent, or consequent restraine it to the Altar: Nor of Bread, and Wyne Symbolically, and Sacramentally representing the Body, and Bloud of Christ; since Bread, and Wyne cannot produce the spirituall Effects there specified: so cleare it is, that our Sectary in approaching to answere the said Sentences, doth ineuitably runne vpon some one circumstantiall pyke, or other, of the said Authorityes, wherewith he is most dangerously wounded.

That this my Reply may be more cleerely conceaued, I will instance it in this one Testimony following which shall serue, as a Precedent for all the rest of the same nature; The like course of exemplifying I will obserue in all other kynds of their Answers; and though such places were afore alledged, yet here they are produced vpon a different occasion.

S. Augustine then in l. 6. Confess. c. 13. thus writeth touching his Mother: *Tantummodo memoriam sui ad Altare tuum fieri desiderauit, vnde sciret dispensari Victimam sanctam, qua deletum est chyrographum, quod erat contrarium nobis.*] Only she desired, that remembrance of her might be made at thy Altar, from whence she did know the holy Sacrifice to be dispensed (*or giuen*) by the which the hand-writing, which was contrary to vs is defaced.] Out of this place we proue (as we shewed aboue) that by *Victima sancta* here specified by S. *Augustine*, is vnderstood the Body and Bloud of Christ. Now heere it cānot be answered, that the Body of Christ is meant, as it is in Heauen; becauſe he ſaith, that this *Victima* is diſpenſed, or diſtributed from the Altar, which thing agreeth not with his Body, as it is in Heauen: Neither can it be ſaid (as ſome ſeeme to interprete it) of the Bread, and Wine Typically ſignifying the Body, and Bloud of Chriſt, in that the Bread & Wine was not the Sacrifice, which was offered for vs vpon the Croſſe. And thus much of this firſt kind of our Aduerſaries Anſwere.

Another forme of euading the preſſures, & weights of the Fathers Authorityes is this: That if in the alleaged Authority, there can be found but any one word, which is to be accepted not litterally, but figuratiuely, metaphorically, or in ſome other forced conſtruction; then our Allegoricall Sectarie inferres therupon, that the whole Sentence (though moſt ſtrōgly fortifying the Catholike doctrine heerin) is to be taken figuratiuely, & not literally, vrging, that ſeeing, both the points are cōtayned in one, and the ſame Sentence, or Period, and that the one by our confeſſion is not to be vnderſtood literally, why ſhould the other obiected by vs, be taken literally?

The Transparency of which Answere is easily seene through. And first we are to know, and obserue, that euery thing, which is not deliuered in plaine, and literall words, proceedeth not alwayes from an intention of Rhetoricke, or Amplification in the Writer, but often euen out of Necessity, since somtimes we are forced thernnto, as not hauing that natiue habit of speach, & words, wherwith otherwise we would apparrell the true conceipts of our Mind; which scarsitie of apt wordes, may perhaps be sometimes found in the writings of the Fathers: yet hence it followeth not, that all the rest (adioyned therto) must partake of the same want.

Againe, whether this kind of writing riseth out of a defect of words, or out of a delicacy, and choiceneesse of a Mans pen, yet the Argument hence deduced is inconsequent, since by this reason we may inferre, that almost no one Text of the *Apocalyps* may be alleaged as literally to proue, or disproue any thing: and why? becausesome adioyning parcell therof is set downe in a Figuratiue kind of speach. And thus we cannot alleadge (contrary to all ancient Expositours) that Text in the Apocalyps, *These are they, which haue washed their Robes, & haue made them white in the Bloud of the Lambe, cap. 7.* to proue, that Martyrs, and other Saints of God are saued by the Bloud of Christ: becausse (forsooth) in the said Sentence there are two Metaphors; to wit, the long Robes (wherby are signified the Bodyes of the Saints) and the word Lambe (meaning therby Christ) and therfore it should follow vpō the said ground, that the word *Bloud*, must also be here a Metaphor, not signifying bloud indeed (and so excluding the Bloud of Christ frō our saluation) but some other thing shaddowed therby.

Yea which is more (if this kind of Answere were solide) we could scarce produce any one sentence of the Psalmes, literally to be expounded of Christ, or his Church (in which Authorityes we Christians mainly insist against the Iewes) since that part of Scripture is most luxuriant of Tropes, Schemes, and other Figuratiue speaches; And yet we see, that it is most incongruous to maintaine, that any whole Psalme is to be interpreted Allegorically, because we find certaine Figures in some Passages thereof.

Thus it is euident, how defectiue this Answere is, which consisteth in resoluing the Fathers sentences into Figuratiue Senses. But our Aduersaries boldnesse stayeth not heere in deprauing after this sort Mans word; but extendeth it selfe to corrupt in like manner (by ouer much origenizing, and mystically interpreting it) Gods sacred word.

This second Forme of Answere I will illustrate with this Testimony following. *S. Chrysostome Homil. de Eucharist. in Encaenijs*, thus writeth. *Num vides Panem? num Vinum? num sicut reliqui cibi in secessum vadunt? Absit, ne nec cogites. Quemadmodum enim si cera igni adhibita illi assimilatur, nihil substantiæ remanet, nihil superfluit; sic & hic puta mysteria consumi corporis substantia.* Doest thou see Bread? doest thou see Wyne? doe these things goe into the common passage, as other meates? Let it be farre from thee to thinke so. For euen as Waxe being put in the fire, is assimilated, or made like to it, no part of the substance remayning: or redounding: So heere imagine, that the Mysteries are consumed through the Substance of the Body.] Of this place I haue entreated aboue. But heere now we are to take notice, that our Aduersa-

nies labour to delude the force therof by answering, that those words of this Testimony *Mysteria consumi*, are not to be vnderstood literally (for so they should be false) in that the externall Formes of Bread, and Wyne (which are conteyned in the word *Mysteria*) are not consumed by the accession of the Body of Christ: for we see that the Accidences of Bread, and Wyne remaine euen after Consecration; seeing then, say they, that these words are not to be taken literally, but figuratiuely, therefore the whole sentence aforegoing is also to be taken figuratiuely, and not literally. And thus they seeke to euade this most pregnant Testimony; whereby the Word *Mysteria* is vnderstood, that the Substance only of the Bread, and Wyne are consumed.

A third Branch of their Euasiõs, shootes out to such Authorityes of the Fathers, as refer the effectuating of this Mystery to Gods sole Omnipotency, marshalling it (in regard of the difficulties discouered therein) with the abstruseſt points of Christianity, and ranging it (by reason of the great Miracle there exhibited) with the greateſt Miracles euer performed by God.

Now their Answere heerto is, that the Eucharist is wrought by the Omnipotency of God; for seeing it is a Sacrament, not Man, but God only (and consequently his Omnipotency is heere necessarily exacted) is able to institute the same. How rouing, and wandring this is from the scope, and drift of the Fathers shall heere appeare. First from the words of the Fathers themselues, which doe euen depose a contrary meaning in them; for they in those places alledged of this nature, doe not assigne the Omnipotency of God to the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrament (for hereof they intimate for the most part,

not the least touch) but to it, as therein one Substance by force of certaine words, is truly turned into another Substance.

Secondly, the weakneſſe of the former Anſwere appeareth, in that we graunt, that an Omnipotency indeed is required to the Inſtitution of any Sacrament, wherby it ſhould iuſtifie a Man: but our Aduerſaries will not belieue, that the Sacraments (as Inſtruments of Chriſt, & where due preparation is) do confer immediately Grace (for this were in them an ouer-vnkind relinquiſhing of Senſe, and too ſtraite an Entercourſe, & Cõmerce with their vnderſtanding) but they teach, that the Sacraments do iuſtify vs, only by ſignifying, and repreſentation; becauſe (ſay they) they are made things to vs, in the ſignification wherof we apprehend Chriſt by Faith. And ſo their Omnipotency heere formally reſteth in creating a new ſignification of a thing; to wit; that the naturall ſubſtance of the Sacraments ſhould repreſent, & ſignify Chriſt, whom (afore his Inſtitution therof) they did not ſignify. Now, if Omnipotency muſt neceſſarily concurre to the making, that one thing may ſignify another thing, then by the ſaid ground euery ſeely Ale-wife is Omnipotent, in that her red Lattice, or Buſh at the doore (things of themſelues indifferent, as not carrying any reference to her profeſſion) are made by her to be a ſufficient Type, Signe, or Repreſentation to the Paſſengers, of the Ale which ſhe hath to ſell; ſo cleare it is, that a Reall change, not an Impoſition of a new ſignification requireth an Omnipotency. Now (as in the former I haue done) I will inſtance this anſwere in ſome one authority.

S. Cyprian Serm. de Cœna Dom. (of which place I haue entrea-

entreated aboue) thus writeth: *Panis iste, quem Dominus Discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed natura mutatus, Omnipotentia Verbi factus est Caro &c.* This Bread, which our Lord gaue to his Disciples, being changed not in outward shew, but in nature, is by the Omnipotency of the Word made Flesh.] Now, what intimation is heere made to ascribe the Omnipotency of God heere expressed, to the Eucharist, only in that it is a Sacrament? Or with what tecture, or pretext of Reason can any such exorbitant cō-struction be heere forged? since (as is already proued) an Omnipotency is required in the Institution of Sacraments, that they may truely performe that, which they do signify, to wit, that they do iustify Man (but this efficacy of them, our Sacramentaries do altogeather reiect) but no Omnipotency is exacted to make, that a thing may signify what afore it did not, for this not only God, but Man is able to performe.

Their fourth Answere belongeth to such places, which preferre the Eucharist before the Iewish Types, and Figures (wherin Christ was as perfectly shaddowed and signified as in the Eucharist, if there be nothing else there, but Bread, and Wine.) The insufficiency of the Sacramentaries Answere heerto made, is fully, and at large displayed in the Marginall References touching the diuersity of the Types of the Eucharist, and the Eucharist it selfe: to which (a) place I referre the Reader, partly as affecting heere expedition, & breuity; and partly as being loath, wearisomely to cloy with a needlesse iteration of one, & the same thing, the fastidious eares of our curious Age.

Another forme of their shuffling Answeres is that, wherwith they labour to breake through all such Passa-

ges,

ges of the Fathers, which do assigne any reuerence whatsoeuer to the Eucharist eyther of Adoration, Inuocation, or in any other sort. To all which they giue vs this yawning, heedlesse, and doubtfull solution: That if any such reuerence was exhibited by the Fathers to the Eucharist, it was not terminated in the Eucharist it selfe, but directed to Christ (signified therein) and so by the mediation of those earthly Elements, transferred to him, who is in Heauen; no otherwise then when the Papists (for thus do they particulerly instance) praying before Images, direct not their prayers to the Image, but to Christ, or the Saint represented therein. But heere I would aske them what secret Intelligence they (now comming so long after) can haue of the Fathers minds, and intentions heerin? If they insist in the words, we find no appearance of the least glance thereof; if they call to mind the practise of the Church of those Ages (the secureſt Scholie, or Paraphrase of the Fathers writings) it seales vp the Truth in our behalfe.

Furthermore I say, that the Sacramentary is of a Lethargious, and forgetfull constitution (a point, according to the old *Oportet* &c. very disaduantagious to his profession;) or if not so, then is he so Serpentinely affected against the Catholikes, as that, so he may be opposite to them, he is content to be vnfaithfull to himselfe. For at other times he ryots both in Pulpit, and by Pen with great profusion of Words, and Tyme, telling such as will belieue him, that the Catholikes doe pray to Pictures, and place in them a kind of Diuinity; whereas now, he is content (courteously) to acknowledge the lawfull, and religious practise of the Catholikes therein; since he cannot cast any aspersion of Idolatry, or superstition

stition vpon vs, but he is forced (except he will receaue a more dangerous Wound) to insimulate the Fathers within the said Errour.

Heere then I demand of them (for they are most fugitiue, and vncertaine in answering heereunto) will they acknowledge the Fathers Reuerence, Adoration, and praying to the Eucharist it selfe? why then do they longer so pertinaciously persist in defending their Sacramentarian doctrine? Will they seeke by inflexions, and wyndings to diuert the honor done to the Sacrament, to Christ only (represented therein) as he is in Heauen? If so, why doe these Anti-Saints, and Enemyes of Gods Seruants at other times spend themselues out in such estuation, and heate of rayling inuectiues (the scumne of base malice, and proper Scene of too many of our Sectaryes) against the Catholikes for performing that, which now for their owne aduantage in a different example, though like reason, they willingly (yet falsly) obtrude vpon the Fathers; thus if the Sacramentary do escape the sword of *Iehu*, yet shall the sword of *Elisæus* slay him; and thus we see, how weake this his answere is, wherein his gayne heere made, is like to the gayne of ground, which a running Water causeth, getting no more on the one side of the Banke, then it looseth on the other.

This their Answere shalbe exemplified in that Testimony of *S. Dionysius*, who *lib. de Hierarch. Eccles. c. 3. part. 3.* thus writeth: *O Diuinissimum, & Sacrosanctum Sacramentum! obducta tibi significantium signorum operimenta dignanter aperi, & perspicuè nobis fac appareas; nostrosq; spirituales oculos singulari, & aperto tuæ Lucis fulgore imple.* O most diuine, and holy Sacrament! vouchsafe to open

(or remoue) the couerings of thy signifying signes, and make thy selfe to appeare clearly to vs, and fill our spirituall Eyes with the open Fulgor of thy Light.] Wherto *Peter Martyr lib. contra Garainer. part. 1. obiect.* 150. answereth according to the tenour of the former Euasion. Where we see (besides what is already said) that *Dionysius* doth not heere inuoke Christ only before the Sacrament (as the Catholikes do before his Image) but he doth inuoke the Sacrament it self, & desireth such things of it, as are required only of God; from whence it followeth, that *Dionysius* thought, that Christ being God, and Man, was contained truly in the Sacrament, or rather, that Christ with the externall Symbols togeather was the Sacrament.

The sixt, and last Ward, wherwith our Aduersaries seeke to put by the dãgerously pointed Sentences of the Fathers, is appropriated only to such their Authorities, wherin it is affirmed, that in the celebratiõ of the Eucharist, there is a true, & Reall Sacrifice performed, meaning the offering vp by the words, and hands of the Priest the very Body, & Bloud of Christ to his Father. Now, to these Authorities they frame an answere wouen of seuerall threeds, either of ignorant, or wilfull mistakings. For, they say that the Eucharist might be termed by the Fathers a Sacrifice for diuers reasons. And first, by reason of the Oblation of the Faithfull, who in the Supper of our Lord do consecrate themselues to God. Or, of the Preaching of the death of our Lord. Or of the diuers exercises of Piety (as of Faith, Hope, Penitency, Charity &c,) or of Prayers, or of Thanksgiuing to God, or finally of the Almes: all which seuerall points, were particulerly performed (say they) in those former ancient Tymes in

the

the Celebration of the Eucharist, & which may be rightly termed Spirituall Sacrifices.

Now, that these Actions (suppoſing that in a Metaphoricall conſtruction they might be ſo ſtyled, and were vſed then) are not vnderſtood in the former paſſages of the Fathers, I thus proue, in that thoſe Doctours plainly teach, that the Body, and Bloud of Chriſt is the Sacrifice, which is offered vp in the Church, but thoſe former Actions cannot be meant, and ſignified, (by any kind of ſpeach euer heard of) by the Body, and Bloud of Chriſt. As for example, *S. Ambroſe* writeth *in Pſal.* 38. *Etſi Chriſtus nunc non videatur offerre, ipſe tamen offertur in terris, cùm corpus eius offertur.* Though Chriſt now may be thought not to offer vp (*or ſacrifice*) yet he himſelfe is heere offered vp vpon earth, when his body is offered vp.] Which wordes can in no ſort be applyed to thoſe former actions ſpecified to be in the Adminiſtration of the Eucharist. Againe, the Fathers teach, that onely Prieſts, and no others can offer vp this Sacrifice. Thus doth *S. Hierome epiſt. ad Euagrium*, yea the Councell of *Nyce* it ſelfe exempteth Deacons from offering vp the Sacrifice: and *Tertullian l. de velandis Virginum*, Women in generall; and *Epiphanius hæreſ.* 79. particulerly the *Virgin Mary*; but it is manifeſt, that Prayers, Almes, Laudes, giuing of Thanks, an internall offering vp of the Soule (of all which points the former anſwere is aggregated) are offered vp, and performed by the whole People, much more then they may be by Deacons.

A ſecond Branch of their Euaſions to the ſaid Authorities is deduced from the Etymologies of the word *Sacrificium*, or *Sacrificare*, which is but *Sacra facere*, therfore ſay they, becauſe the Conſecration, or Diſtribution

of the Eucharist is *Sacra actio*, the Action, or Celebratiõ of it, is called *Sacrificium*, and the Minister, who performeth the same, may be said *Sacrificare*. Which Grammaticall, or Dictionary Answere (vnworthy indeed the learned Eares of the Iudicious) is thus refelled. First, because in all Etymologies we are to respect *non tam à quo, quàm ad quid*; not so much the Primatiues, or Originalls from whence they are deriued, as the applications, whereunto by vse, and custome they are particulerly tied. And thus answerably hereto, we graunt that Baptisme is *Sacra actio* (since it is *Lauacrum Regenerationis*) and yet we cannot read in any place of their Writings, where *Baptisme* is called *Sacrificium*, or he who baptizeth, is said *Sacrificare*. Againe, though euery sacred Action might καταχρηστικῶς, and *abusiuè* be called a Sacrifice, yet this would aduantage our Aduersaries nothing; since in the former testimonies of the Fathers, not the transient Action of celebrating the Eucharist, but the permanent thing, which is sacrificed (to wit the Body, and Bloud of Christ) is called by them the Sacrifice.

Lastly, though by this sleight the Sacramentaries might seeme to wrench the ordinary, and naturall construction of all such places, where the word *Sacrificium*, or *Sacrificare* is found, yet this is impertinent to diuers passages of the Fathers aboue cited, wherein the words *Oblatio*, or *Offerre* are. As that (besides many others) of *S. Augustine l. 4. de Trinitat. c. 14. Quid gratiùs offerri, aut suscipi possit, quàm caro Sacrificij nostri corpus effectum Sacerdotis nostri?*]

The third, and last kynd of their expounding the former Authorities, is, that the Supper of our Lord is called a Sacrifice, or an Oblation, because it includeth

in

in it selfe a certaine Commemoration, or Representation of a true Sacrifice, viz. of the death of Christ.

To this we reply, that it is true, that the Action of the Eucharist is a Similitude, or Memoriall of the Sacrifice of the Crosse: yet hence it followeth not, that the Fathers therefore thought not, that a true, and proper sacrifice was offered vp in the celebration of the Eucharist. Now, that the Fathers did beleeue the Eucharist to be a true Sacrifice, and not only a representatiue Sacrifice, is clearely euicted out of these ensuing obseruations. First, because Baptisme is a Sacrament representing the death of Christ; for the Apostle *Rom. 6.* teacheth, that the immersion of the partie baptized representeth the death of Christ, and the taking him out of the Water, the resurrection of Christ, and yet no one of the Fathers doe terme Baptisme a Sacrifice.

Againe, the Fathers do often adioyne certaine Epithets, which are peculiar only to a true Sacrifice: Thus *S. Cyprian l. 2. epist. 3.* calls the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, *Plenum, & Verum Sacrificium*: and S. Chrysostome, *Sacrificium terribile, & plenum horroris*. Which Adiuncts are most fondly giuen to a meere representatiue Sacrifice.

Thirdly, the Fathers diuers times doe vse the words *Victima*, and *Sacrificium*, in the plurall number (so doth *S. Cyprian l. 1. epist. 2. & l. 2. epist. 3. &c.*) but this phrase were most improper if it should be vnderstood of the Eucharist, as it is only a commemoration of the death of Christ; for since only one thing is heere represented, therefore the name therof is to be deliuered only in the singular number.

Fourthly, and lastly if this consequence were of weight: *The Eucharist is a Representation of the Sacrifice of*

the Crosse, Ergo, *it is no true, and proper Sacrifice*: then this Illation should also be necessary (for both are wrought vpon one, and the selfe same frame) *The Sacrifices of the old Law were representations of the Sacrifice of the Crosse*, Ergo, *they were no true* (but only representatine) *Sacrifices*. For as the Eucharist is a Remembrance, & Representation of the sacrifice of the Crosse already accomplished: so they were Representations of the said Sacrifice then to come.

And thus far concerning the Sacramentaries Euasions in generall, wherwith they labour to corrupt the most forcible, and conuincing places of the Fathers (so the *Harpyes* euer defiled the purest meates.) Indeed they preuayle with some of the vulgar sort, whose Iudgments are so aëry, vaporous, and light, as that they are not able to descend into the depth of any exquisite enquiry of things; and so by these sleights our Sectaries (rather then they will acknowledge the Fathers true meaning) do retayne for the tyme their honour, & credit with such their followers; but whē this their Sophistry comes to be examined by the cleare, and impartiall iudgment of the learned, either Catholike, or Protestant: then are their answers found to be attended with such violent, and forced constructions of the Fathers writings, necessarily exhaling forth strange improbabilities, mistakings, and absurdities; as that they being once scanned, are the cause of their greater, and more shamefull future ouerthrow. And thus their fortune herein may seeme to partake of the misfortune of the poore Hare, which for a time by the help of her feet, auoyds the danger of the Hūters, but yet after, her said feet betray her a new to her enemies, to her greater perill.

Now,

Now, I will close vp this Chapter with one weighty consideration: It is this. Wheras the Fathers haue written of the Eucharist most reuerently in all fulnes, and transcendency of stile (as appeareth out of their places alledged) so as if their sayings be not to be disuested of their litterall sense, then they irrefragably (euen by our Aduersaries confessions) do warrant our Catholike doctrine. How chanceth, that not one Father (among so many) would neuer giue some caution, nor the least insinuation, that either his owne Sentences, or those of the rest of them (as being powred out in great aboundance, all magnifying, and aduancing the dignity of this Mysterie) were not to be taken litterally, but that they were Hyperbolical speaches deliuered by them, only by way of Rhetoricall amplifications? What can our Aduersaries reply heerunto? Shall we charge all the Fathers with forgetfulnes in such a point? But that is most improbable, considering the weight of the matter, & their accustomed sollicitude in things of lesser cõsequence? Or shal we think, that being maliciously bent against all posterity, they determinately did leaue behind them such sayings, therby to disseminate Idolatry (for no lesse a fault can it be esteemed in them, if purposely they did write heerin otherwise, then they thought) in the minds of all Readers? But what Christian is so voyd of Charity, and Sense, as to traduce so many holy Fathers liuing in those purer tymes with so heathenish, and hellish an Impiety? Nay I will proceed further in this Point: It is most cleare that the Fathers were so far from giuing any such caution for the sensing of their writings, that some of thẽ haue left a caution iust to the contrary, I meane, that their sayings touching the Eucharist are not to be peruer-

ted by any Figuratiue, or Allegoricall constructions, but as the words doe lye, are so to be taken.

The president of *Hilarius* (a very ancient, and Learned Father) shall heere serue in place of many, who as it were through a Prenotion, and foresight of this our Schismaticall Age (guided by him, with whom there is no Priority or Laterneſſe of Tyme) hath set downe his Syntax, or Grammar for the construction both of himselfe, and the rest of the Fathers in all passages touching the Eucharist. Thus then he saith *c.* 8. *de Trinitate. Non est humano, aut Sæculi sensu in Dei rebus loquendum, neq; per violentam, aut impudentem prædicationem cælestium dictorum sanitati, alienæ, atq; impiæ intelligentiæ extorquenda peruersitas est. Quæ scripta sunt legamus, & quæ legimus intelligamus, & tunc perfectæ fidei officio fungemur. De naturali enim in nobis Christi vnitate &c.* We are not to speake in an humane, or secular sense of the things concerning God, neither through a violent, & impudent forme of speach, any peruersity of a strang, and wicked construction is to be extorted out of the wholesomneſſe of those heauenly sentences. What are written, let vs read, and what we read, let vs vnderstand, and then we shall enioy the office of a prefect faith. For what we speake of the naturall Vnity of Christ in vs, except we learne it of him, we speake fooliſhly, and wickedly, for he saith, *Caro mea verè est esca.*] Thus farre *S. Hilarie:* So much estranged was he, and the rest of those venerable Wryters from willing, that their Testimonyes herein should be cast in the mould of a forced, and figuratiue Interpretation.

(a) To which place.] Viz, the first Chapter of this second Tract.

THAT

THAT ALL THE CHIEFEST OBIECTED

Authorities of the Fathers vrged by the Protestants are impertinent.

CHAP. IX.

I KNOVV well that Nature, and Art (Natures Counterpane) do instruct vs, that in euery perfect discourse of any subiect, we ought in the Front, and beginning to plant the state of the Question proposed, circumstancing it with all such due restrictious, and other cautionary explications, as the mainteiners, and patrons doe willingly acknowledge. For by so doing, the very entrance of the worke (like vnto the skill vsed in the Perspectiues) will cast light vpon the ensuing parts, and withall the Reader may (as it were) optically glasse therin

ſometimes had promiſed his Sonne, did repreſent him truly, when he ſpake thoſe former words in the Mount.

A ſecond Point, which we are to obſerue in the ſtate of this Queſtion, is; That the Euchariſt euen after Conſecration is by the Scripture ſometimes called Bread, for ſo we find it termed by the Apoſtle, 1. *Cor.* 10. *Panis quem frangimus* &c. *The Bread which we breake, is it not the participation of the Body of Chriſt?*] Now, this appellatiõ may be for a double reaſon. Firſt, in that it is an accuſtomed Dialect of Scripture to call a thing by that name, which afore it was, or of which it is made (as hertofore I haue ſhewed.) Thus we read *Gen.* 3. that *Eue* is called the Bone of *Adam*, becauſe ſhe was made therof. And *Exod.* 7. the Serpents of *Moyſes* are termed Wands, becauſe the Wands were turned into Serpents. For this very reaſon we find, that the Euchariſt is ſomtimes called Bread by the Fathers (which places our Aduerſaries are not aſhamed to obiect againſt vs.) Examples heerof we haue in *Origen l.* 8. *contra Celſum*, where he calles the Euchariſt *Panes oblatos*, Bread which are offered vp in Sacrifice; where inſtantly after he ſhewes, that Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt, therby diſtinguiſhing it from other bread. In like ſort, the Euchariſt is called by *Irenæus l.* 4. *contra Hæreſ. c.* 34. πρὸφὴ ἐυχαριστηθεῖσα, *the meate, or bread ſanctified*, or *made the Euchariſt*. In this ſenſe alſo the Euchariſt is called bread by *Ignatius epiſt. ad Philadelph. Chryſoſtome* alſo *homil.* 24. *in prior. ad Cor* calleth the Bread, the Body of Chriſt, meaning bread conſecrated, & not common Bread. Finally, *S. Auguſtine c.* 19. *l. de fide ad Petrum*, calles the Euchariſt, the Sacrament of Bread, & Wine.

The ſecond reaſon, why the Euchariſt may be called

led Bread by the Scripture, is, in regard of the similitude, which it hath with bread; I meane, in nourishing the soule, as the bread nourisheth the body; And in this sense it is so called in *Iohn* 6. *Panis; quem ego dabo, caro mea est pro mundi vita*: The bread, which I will giue, is my flesh for the life of the world. And by reason also of the said resemblance, we find the Eucharist termed Bread by the Fathers; for *Dionysius Eccles. hierarch. c.* 3. *part.* 3. calles the Sacrament *Diuine, and Heauenly Bread*; for the same reason *Tertullian l.* 3. *contra Marcion*. termes the Eucharist Bread, to wit, the bread of Life; for there the Trope is, that the Body of Christ is called Bread, because it nourisheth like bread; and not, that the bread is there called the Body. Betweene which two Propositions there is great difference, since the first (which is commonly vsed by the Fathers) to wit, the Body of Christ is Bread, presupposeth a true being there of Christs Body, but yet (in regard of nourishing our soules) with some resemblance of bread; wheras the other Proposition (to wit the bread is the Body of Christ) neither hurteth, nor aduantageth our cause, since therto is only required, that bread be in the Eucharist, as far forth, as belong to signification; that is, that the externall formes therof be there, for by reason of the Accidences only, the bread, and wine do signify; thus may Bread be said to be some where in respect of it Accidences only, and not of it Substance: though the body of Christ hath not any such relation of being, I meane, only in regard of it Accidences, & not of it Substance. And heere we may see, how our Sectaries dissent from the Fathers; since they alluding to the nourishment therof, doe figuratiuely call the body of Christ, Bread; wheras the other, with reference only to a naked

ted by any Figuratiue, or Allegoricall constructions, but as the words doe lye, are so to be taken.

The president of *Hilarius* (a very ancient, and Learned Father) shall heere serue in place of many, who as it were through a Prenotion, and foresight of this our Schismaticall Age (guided by him, with whom there is no Priority or Laterneſse of Tyme) hath set downe his Syntax, or Grammar for the construction both of himselfe, and the rest of the Fathers in all passages touching the Eucharist. Thus then he saith *c.* 8. *de Trinitate. Non est humano, aut Sæculi sensu in Dei rebus loquendum, neq; per violentam, aut impudentem prædicationem cælestium dictorum sanitati, alienæ, atq; impiæ intelligentiæ extorquenda peruersitas est. Quæ scripta sunt legamus, & quæ legimus intelligamus, & tunc perfectæ fidei officio fungemur. De naturali enim in nobis Christi vnitate &c.* We are not to speake in an humane, or secular sense of the things concerning God, neither through a violent, & impudent forme of speach, any peruersity of a strang, and wicked construction is to be extorted out of the wholesomneſse of those heauenly sentences. What are written, let vs read, and what we read, let vs vnderstand, and then we shall enioy the office of a prefect faith. For what we speake of the naturall Vnity of Christ in vs, except we learne it of him, we speake fooliſhly, and wickedly, for he saith, *Caro mea verè est esca.*] Thus farre *S. Hilarie*: So much estranged was he, and the rest of those venerable Wryters from willing, that their Testimonyes herein should be cast in the mould of a forced, and figuratiue Interpretation.

(a) *To which place.*] Viz, the first Chapter of this second Tract.

THAT

THAT ALL THE CHIEFEST OBIECTED *Authorities of the Fathers vrged by the Protestants are impertinent.*

CHAP. IX.

I KNOVV well that Nature, and Art (Natures Counterpane) do instruct vs, that in euery perfect discourse of any subiect, we ought in the Front, and beginning to plant the state of the Question proposed, circumstancing it with all such due restrictious, and other cautionary explications, as the mainteiners, and patrons doe willingly acknowledge. For by so doing, the very entrance of the worke (like vnto the skill vsed in the Perspectiues) will cast light vpon the ensuing parts, and withall the Reader may (as it were) optically glasse therin

therin a contracted, and epitomized sight of the whole Treatise. Notwithstanding (contrary heerto) I haue thought good in this Question of the Eucharist, thus far to deferre the placing of the state therof (except what is scatteringly touched, as occasion sometimes hath serued) Which dislocation (I hope) is iustly excusable, since we are not alwayes seruily to tye our selues to other Mens precepts, for in the best Writers somtimes, Art hath ouerruled Art, & Method lyed in breach of Method. My reasō heerin is, to preuent a tedious, and needlesse repetition of one, & the same thing, for seeing in this Chapter we vndertake to shew, that the doubtful, & obscure places, borrowed out of the Fathers writings for the impugning of our Catholike faith, do not in any sort disable the same; it is certaine, that this point will be best cleared, by setting downe, what the Catholikes do hould in this sacred Mysterie: since in a true vnfoulding, & explication therof, we shall find virtually included the solutions of the chief obiected Passages; thus shall we discouer, that the Sacramentaries greatest Peeces of this nature, wherwith in vaine they play vpon the impregnable Fort of Christs owne words, are but charged with certaine rouing, and hurtlesse paper bullets of wrested Authorityes.

Well then, first we teach, that notwithstanding the true, and reall being of Christs Body, and Bloud vnder the externall formes of Bread, and Wine, the Eucharist may be termed a signe in two respects.

First it is a Signe, since it representeth the Body of Christ dying vpon the Crosse, and his Bloud shed vpon the same, answerably to that of *S. Paul* 1. *Cor.* 11. *Mortem Domini annunciabitis, donec veniat*: You shall shew the death of our Lord vntill he come.] Which wordes doe truly

truly paraphraſe that ſaying of our Sauiour, *Hoc facite in meã cõmemorationem*: hauing therin relation to his Paſſiõ. Now in this reference we hould, that the Euchariſt is diſtinguiſhed from his Body, and Bloud, ſince it is not heere in the ſame manner, as it was vpon the Croſſe; the Sacrament being therof but a repreſentation, or commemoration. And in this ſenſe of the Euchariſt being termed a ſigne doth *Ignatius Epiſt. ad Philadelph.* diſtinguiſh the Euchariſt from Chriſts Body, and Bloud.

In this ſenſe alſo *S. Ambroſe Cõment. in c.* 11. *in* 1. *ad Cor.* writeth, that the Body, and Bloud, which were offered for vs vpon the Croſſe, are ſignifyed in the Euchariſt; as alſo he there ſaith, that the myſticall Cup is a Type of our Lords Body, & Bloud. The ſame conſtruction doth *Baſil* receaue, who in his Liturgy calles the Euchariſt Αντιτυπον, that is the Figure of Chriſts Body.

Hitherto alſo are referred thoſe words of *S. Chryſoſtome Homil.* 83. *in Matth.* there calling the Euchariſt *Symbolum Paſſionis Chriſti*. And the ſame conſtruction is to be giuen to that ſo often obiected place of *S. Auguſtine epiſt.* 23. *ad Bonifacium*, where he teacheth, that the Sacraments haue a ſimilitude, or likeneſſe of the thinges, wherof they are Sacraments; and that the Sacrament of the Body, and Bloud of Chriſt is, *ſecundum quemdam modum*, the Body, and Bloud of Chriſt, meaning thereby, that though the Body, and Bloud of Chriſt be in the Euchariſt, according to it true ſubſtance; yet it is not there as it was vpon the Croſſe, but only in ſimilitude; for euen in this place *S. Auguſtine* ſpeakes of the Paſſion, and Death of Chriſt. And this very explication doth that other teſtimony of *S. Auguſtine* admit *lib. contra Adimantum. c.* 12. where he ſaith, that our Sauiour in giuing his

Body, did giue the ſigne of his body, which will cleerely appeare to any one, who with deliberation will conſider the place.

The ſecond Reſpect, wherein the Euchariſt may be called a ſigne, is becauſe it is a Sacrament, and euery Sacrament (according to part of it definition) is *Signum rei Sacræ*. For we hold that thoſe externall ſpecies of bread, and wyne doe ſignify the true Body, and Bloud of Chriſt lying vnder them. And in this reference of the externall formes to the body, and bloud veyled vnder them, are to be vnderſtood *Origen in c. 15. Matth.* where he calles the Euchariſt a *Typicall Body*. *Ambroſe l. de myſteriis initiandis c. 9.* where he ſaith, that after the conſecration, the Body of Chriſt is ſignified.

Now out of theſe Premiſſes we may collect, that it is a diſſolute, and looſe kynd of reaſoning thus to inferre; The Fathers doe call the Euchariſt a ſigne, or Type of Chriſts Body, and Bloud: *Ergo*, they taught, that his body, and bloud were not really in the Euchariſt. For theſe two poynts (as we haue ſhewed aboue) are not incompatible, but may ſtand togeather; for euen in humane matters we find, that one, and the ſame thing may be a ſigne of a thing, and the thing ſignified: thus the wares ſtalled forth in a ſhop (as ſilke, cloth &c.) are ſignes of merchandize to be ſould, & are themſelues merchandize to be ſould. Therefore if our Aduerſaries will produce any auaileable authority touching this point, they muſt alledge the Fathers, teaching, that the Euchariſt is only a ſigne of Chriſts Body, or that it is a meere repreſentation of a thing being abſent: but ſuch Fatherleſſe Poſitions, as theſe, cannot yet be found in the wrytings of the Fathers.

And

And seeing, that the Eucharist is (as we teach) a representation of Chirsts Body, and Bloud in some peculiar senses. I will add (as an appendix hereto) an Annotation of certaine places of the Fathers, wherein the Word *Repræsento* is vsed; the places be, *Tertullian l. 1. contra Marcionem. S. Hierome in c. 26. Matth.* These Testimonyes our Aduersaries doe obiect, in that, it is there said, that the Eucharist doth represent Christ, or the body, and bloud of Christ, or the like. For the true meaning of which testimonyes, we are to obserue, that the Verbe *Repræsento*, is ambiguous, for it signifieth to make a thing present, either truly, and really, or else only in signe, and figure. Now we say, that these Fathers did vse this word in the firster signification, to wit, that Christ did truly, and really exhibite his Body, in that, which was bread afore. Which point we proue because these Fathers haue else where writen most cleerely, and euidently in behalfe of the Reall Presence, and therfore if these their Authorities were otherwise to be vnderstood, then should they either retract their former doctrine (whereof there is no signe) or else should mainly crosse, & contradict themselues; wherewith to charge them were most absurd.

That the Verbe *Repræsento*, is sometimes taken to exhibite, or make a thing present truly, and really, I will content my selfe with the testimony euen of *Tertullian* himselfe. For he *lib. contra Praxeam*, calleth Christ the Sonne, the Representation of the Father, and yet the Father is truly in the Sonne. In like sort, when God the Father said in *Mount Thabor*: *Hic est filius meus &c. Tertullian l. 4. in Marcionem* saith: *Itaq; iam repræsentans eum: Hic est filius meus*; meaning, that, God the Father, who

ſometimes had promiſed his Sonne, did repreſent him truly, when he ſpake thoſe former words in the Mount.

A ſecond Point, which we are to obſerue in the ſtate of this Queſtion, is; That the Euchariſt euen after Conſecration is by the Scripture ſometimes called Bread, for ſo we find it termed by the Apoſtle, 1. *Cor.* 10. *Panis quem frangimus* &c. *The Bread which we breake, is it not the participation of the Body of Chriſt?*] Now, this appellatiō may be for a double reaſon. Firſt, in that it is an accuſtomed Dialect of Scripture to call a thing by that name, which afore it was, or of which it is made (as hertofore I haue ſhewed.) Thus we read *Gen.* 3. that *Eue* is called the Bone of *Adam*, becauſe ſhe was made therof. And *Exod.* 7. the Serpents of *Moyſes* are termed Wands, becauſe the Wands were turned into Serpents. For this very reaſon we find, that the Euchariſt is ſomtimes called Bread by the Fathers (which places our Aduerſaries are not aſhamed to obiect againſt vs.) Examples heerof we haue in *Origen l.* 8. *contra Celſum*, where he calles the Euchariſt *Panes oblatos*, Bread which are offered vp in Sacrifice; where inſtantly after he ſhewes, that Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt, therby diſtinguiſhing it from other bread. In like ſort, the Euchariſt is called by *Irenæus l.* 4. *contra Hæreſ. c.* 34. πρόφ εὐχαριστηθέν, *the meate, or bread ſanctified*, or *made the Euchariſt*. In this ſenſe alſo the Euchariſt is called bread by *Ignatius epiſt. ad Philadelph. Chryſoſtome* alſo *homil.* 24. *in prior. ad Cor* calleth the Bread, the Body of Chriſt, meaning bread conſecrated, & not common Bread. Finally, *S. Auguſtine c.* 19. *l. de fide ad Petrum*, calles the Euchariſt, the Sacrament of Bread, & Wine.

The ſecond reaſon, why the Euchariſt may be called

led Bread by the Scripture, is, in regard of the similitude, which it hath with bread; I meane, in nouriſhing the ſoule, as the bread nouriſheth the body; And in this ſenſe it is ſo called in *Iohn* 6. *Panis: quem ego dabo, caro mea eſt pro mundi vita*: The bread, which I will giue, is my fleſh for the life of the world. And by reaſon alſo of the ſaid reſemblance, we find the Euchariſt termed Bread by the Fathers; for *Dionyſius Eccleſ. hierarch. c.* 3. *part.* 3. calles the Sacrament *Diuine, and Heauenly Bread*; for the ſame reaſon *Tertullian l.* 3. *contra Marcion.* termes the Euchariſt Bread, to wit, the bread of Life; for there the Trope is, that the Body of Chriſt is called Bread, becauſe it nouriſheth like bread; and not, that the bread is there called the Body. Betweene which two Propoſitions there is great difference, ſince the firſt (which is commonly vſed by the Fathers) to wit, the Body of Chriſt is Bread, preſuppoſeth a true being there of Chriſts Body, but yet (in regard of nouriſhing our ſoules) with ſome reſemblance of bread; wheras the other Propoſition (to wit the bread is the Body of Chriſt) neither hurteth, nor aduantageth our cauſe, ſince therto is only required, that bread be in the Euchariſt, as far forth, as belong to ſignification; that is, that the externall formes therof be there, for by reaſon of the Accidences only, the bread, and wine do ſignify; thus may Bread be ſaid to be ſome where in reſpect of it Accidences only, and not of it Subſtance: though the body of Chriſt hath not any ſuch relation of being, I meane, only in regard of it Accidences, & not of it Subſtance. And heere we may ſee, how our Sectaries diſſent from the Fathers; ſince they alluding to the nouriſhment therof, doe figuratiuely call the body of Chriſt, Bread; wheras the other, with reference only to a naked

a naked representation, do figuratiuely call the Bread, the Body of Christ.

And thus much of these two Reasons, why the Scriptures, aud the Fathers doe sometimes call the Eucharist, Bread, or Wyne. Whereunto I might adioyne a third cause, in that the Scripture (and consequently the Fathers) doth often call things, as they externally appeare to the Eye; So the Scripture (as aboue I shewed) calles Angells, which appeared in humane shape, Men; the Brasen Serpent, a Serpent &c. Wherfore the Eucharist may be tearmed Bread, and Wyne either by the Scripture, or the Fathers, in that to the Eye, it seemeth only as Bread and Wine.

To this point I thinke good to range this one Note touching the writings of the Fathers, which is, that some of the Fathers (though most seldome) do say that the substances of the externall Symboles doe remaine after Consecration; Where they are to be vnderstood, that they speake of the essence, and nature of the Accidences, and not of the substances of Bread, and Wyne: An example whereof we find in *Theodoret Dialog.* 2. who there teacheth, that the Mysticall signes after consecration do remaine in their former substances, figure, and forme. Now this is meant of the nature of the accidences, and not of the Substance of bread, and wyne; This is proued diuers wayes: first, because the two Greeke words. φύσις, and ὐσία (both which *Theodoret* being a greeke Father heere vseth) containe euery kind of essence, and nature, aswell of accidences as of substances. Secondly, because *Theodoret* doth expound himselfe in the words following, saying that we see, and touch the said colour, and forme, which words haue necessarily reference only

to

to the outward Accidences. Thirdly, in that we Catholikes doe vrge this very place in proofe of the Reall Presence, for heere *Theodoret* plainly saith, that the Body of Christ is to be vnderstood, to be belieued, and adored in the Eucharist; and therefore to be vnderstood, belieued, adored (saith he) because the bread of the Eucharist (to wit, the bread consecrated) is truly that, which is vnderstood, belieued, and adored.

The same exposition doth a Testimony alledged out of *Gelasius* admit *lib. de duabus naturis*; which testimony we also produce, in that, it teacheth, that the bread is changed into a diuine substance by the working of the Holy Ghost. Thus we see, that the Sacramentaries are not ashamed (so needfull, and begging of proofes is Heresy) ont of the least appearance of aduantage, or naked sound of wordes; to retort the very same sayings of the Fathers against vs, in which, we for the fortifying of our Catholike doctrine do vehemently insist; Belike they thinke, that the Fathers were irresolute in their faith, or that their writings doe stand according to the Prospective of ech Mans humor, so as the Sense may that way looke, as euery Eye (behoulding the words) would haue it.

Heere now I will end this consideration of the Eucharist being called bread, with a short animaduersion of our Aduersaries petulant frowardnes discouered herein, who lighting vpon some few straying passages, where the Eucharist is called Bread, presently (as if they had found another *Sparta*, to enrich with their discourse) they crie out in great prodigality of words, that it is nothing but materiall bread; and yet when in euery leafe, or page of the Fathers workes vpon this matter, they find it

termed, the Body, and Bloud of Christ, all such places (or else we wrong them) must needs be interpreted figuratiuely: Thus insisting much in those phrases, which are but rare in the Fathers, and passing ouer with a censuring neglect, such forme of speaches, as most frequently occurre in their bookes.

A third Point, which we hould in this high Mysterie, is, touching the effect therof, of which, much hath bene already deliuered, only heere it will be necessary to recapitulate some of the former matter. Heere we teach that though the end therof be principally to feed our Soules, yet doth it giue a spirituall nourishmẽt to our bodyes; since our Bodyes therby are nourished to immortality, taking euen frõ the touch of Christs Flesh a certaine disposition to a glorious resurrection, and immortall life, sorting to that of *Iohn c. 6. Qui manducat meam carnem &c. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my bloud, hath life euerlasting, and I will raise him vp at the last day.* Now though the Fathers in their Writings do conspire with the Scripture, and vs heerin; yet will our Aduersaries peruert such their Testimonies, who finding, that they say, that the Eucharist doth nourish our bodyes somtimes without any further explication of the mãner, do therupõ inforce, that since Christs Body doth not nourish our bodies, therfore only bread, and wine, and not his Body, is in the Sacrament; so materially, and grossely do our Aduersaries mistake the Fathers iudgments heerin, Examples of this we haue in many of the Fathers, as *Irenæus lib. 4. contra Hæres. Nyssenus Orat. catechet. c. 36 & 37.* besides diuers others heertofore alleaged; So as these very places ascribing (according to their true exposition) a greater vertue to the Eucharist, then our Aduersaries will acknow-

knowledge, may fully instruct vs (as before is shewed at large) that the Fathers beleiued the very Body, & Bloud of Christ to be in the Eucharist.

A fourth Point also toucheth the efficacy of the Eucharist; for we teach, that the fruite, and benefit therof consisteth not in delighting our Bodyes (as corporall meates do) but in nourishing, and strengthening of our Soules: and therfore in respect of the effect, and fruite therof, to eate the flesh of Christ, is to beleiue in him, & to remaine in him by Charity. This we deduce out of the words of our Sauiour himselfe, who speaking of this Mysterie *Iohn* 6. thus saith: *Spiritus est, qui viuificat* &c. *It is the spirit which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.* And againe, subioyneth to the former words: *Verba quæ ego* &c. *The words which I haue spoken to you are spirit, and life.*] The meaning of which latter sentence (being coincident with the former) instructeth vs, that a carnall vnderstanding of the Eucharist, as if it should be eaten as other meates are (for so the *Capharnaites* framed to themselues) auayleth nothing; but that we ought to cõceaue, that things diuine, and spirituall are heere deliuered to vs, which we are not to entertaine in a humane sense, but by faith, and apprehension inspired by God; yet so by faith, as that we beleiue Christs sacred Body, and Bloud to be heere truly, and really taken.

Hence now it is, that the Fathers resting vpon the former words of Christ, and therfore chiefly ayming at the auaylable receauing of the Eucharist, do write sometimes, that we are to eate the Body of Christ by Faith, and not with teeth, not excluding therby a corporall receauing of Christ (as the Sacramentaries do suggest) but teaching, that the benefit, and operation of the Eucha-

rist is chiefely to nourish, and fortify our Soules with spirituall, and Theologicall vertues. In this sense is *S. Cyprian* to be vnderstood in seuerall passages of his Sermon *de Cœna Domini*, who there thus concludeth: *Quod esca est carni, hoc animæ est fides*. In the same construction also is *Athanasius* (*tract.* vpon the wordes, *Quicumq; dixerit verbum in filium hominis*) to be taken, who there calleth the flesh of Christ *Alimoniam spiritualem*, a spirituall nourishment, in that it is giuen for meate of the Spirit, and not of the Body. The same Interpretation is to be made of *S. Augustine tract. 25. in Ioan. Quid paras dentem, & ventrem? crede, & manducasti.* And *tract. 26. Credere in eum, hoc est, manducare panem viuum*; though the one (if not both) of these places by the iudgements of some, not without great probability, is to be vnderstood, not of the Eucharist, but of the spirituall eating of Christ, through faith, and belief of his Incarnation.

Now out of this former ground results an obseruation not to be neglected, to wit, that seeing the effect of the Eucharist is, that the soule may remaine in Christ by faith and charity, and that such, as doe not truly beliue in Christ, doe not with the intended fruit thereof eate the Sacrament; therefore the Fathers (leuelling only at the benefit, which the Receauers reape thereby) doe write somtimes, that the Misbelieuers, and Men of bad life, do not eate in the Sacrament the body, and bloud of Christ; which sayings our Aduersaries doe most calumniously wrest, inferring from thence, that the Fathers doctrine was, that such misbelieuers, and other wicked persons do not take at all the Body, & Bloud of Christ in the Sacrament, and that therefore his Body, and Bloud is not in the Eucharist; which is most farre from their meaning;

meaning; who in such places (as I haue said) haue reference only to the profitable eating of Christs Body, whereof the wicked are not partakers. In this sense is to be vnderstood *Origen. in* 15. *Matth. S. Hierome in comment. in c.* 66. *Isaiæ. & in c.* 22. *Ieremiæ*; and finally S. *Augustin. tract.* 59. where he saith, that the rest of the Apostles did eate *Panem Dominum*, but *Iudas* only *Panem Domini*, because he receaued no fruite by his eating: See him also in *sermone de Verbis Apostoli*, where he writeth, that the wicked doe not take the body of our Lord, who (as chiefly insisting in a fruitfull eating thereof) there saith: *Illud manducare, refici est: Illud bibere, quid est nisi credere?*

And thus much concerning the true state of this question of the Eucharist, which being heere sincerely set downe, may serue to salue diuers such places of the Fathers, as seeme to fortify, and strengthen the Sacramentarian Heresy. Some other few Passages there are, of which our Aduersaries take hould, which receaue their Answeres out of the circumstances of such places, so as an obseruant Reader (carefully there noting the scope of the Father, as also the words precedent, & subsequent) may easily find out; and therefore, as not being reduced to any one generall head of explication, I remit them (for greater breuity) to the studious search of the iudicious Reader.

But before I finish this Chapter, I will subnect therto some few short animaduersions, which a discreet Reader may take as a Correctiue, wherwith to tast the more obscure writings of the Fathers herein without dãger; The which obseruations, in that they shall not be meerely aëry, and speculatiue, or like Accidences without

out Substances, I will make choyce of *S. Augustine*, in whome they shall (as I may terme it) inhere; exemplifying them in him (rather then in any other) becauſe our Aduerſaries in this Controuerſie with great vendication, and ſhew of confidence, ſeeme to rely vpon this Father.

Firſt then, he is to know, that the Fathers omitting ſometimes the literall ſenſe of the words of the Euangeliſts, or Apoſtles (as confeſſed) do giue ſome other Tropicall, or Myſticall interpretation of them (which courſe they often vſe in expoſition of other parcells of Scripture.) After this manner *S. Auguſtine* paſſing ouer the immediate, literall, and acknowledged ſenſe of eating Chriſts Body, thus ſaith, *in* 26. *in Ioan. Credere in eum, hoc eſt, manducare carnem eius.*

Another Animaduerſion may be, diligently to conferre the more cleare places of a Father touching the Euchariſt, with the more doubtfull of the ſame Father; for it is true, that their Writings do affoard ſome darke ſayings touching this Myſterie; but it as is true, that they do miniſter vs moſt pregnant, and vnanſwerable proofes for our Catholike doctrine heerin; Thus do we find, that diuers paſſages alleaged out of *S. Auguſtine*, as particulerly, *in Pſal.* 33. *concion.* 1. vpon the words, *Et ferebatur manibus ſuis*: and *l.* 3. *de Trinit. c.* 10. diſputing vpon the formes, wherin the Angells appeared, and, *in Pſal.* 98. vpon the words, *Adorate ſcabellum pedum eius*; do more ſtrongly proue, and fortifie this our Catholike doctrine, then any other Countertexts obiected out of him, do weaken it. Seeing then, that *Auguſtine* vnretracted, doth not impugne *Auguſtine*, is followeth euen in reaſon, that the more obſcure paſſages are to be illuſtrated by the more perſpicuous, and euident, and not the contrary; ſince

ſince Darkeneſſe cannot giue Light to light: nor Vncertainty become a Rule of Certainty.

A third Caution is, to remember that ſome of the ancient Fathers are ſo full, and reſolute in this point, as that euen by the acknowledgment of all, they are not capable of any ſolutions, but confeſſed (and therfore reiected) to confirme the Reall Preſence. Now, ſeeing that ſuch Fathers ſo writing are not cõtradicted by any other Fathers; it is therfore from hence neceſſarily inferred, that thoſe other Fathers, that write more obſcurely therof, did neuertheleſſe conſpire, and agree with the former in doctrine heerin: which contradiction of any Noueliſme in Religion, we find to haue bene in all ages; as appeareth (to omit the examples of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, & *Cypriã*) by the many regiſtred Hereſies by *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, & *Auguſtine*. If then *S. Auguſtine* had written heerin contrary to the plaine teſtimonies of his age, or the immediate tymes after him, is it probable, that none of them would haue taxed him, as ſwaruing in this point from the vnity of Faith? Or if the Fathers of his dayes, & other precedent tymes, had in ſuch their perſpicuous ſayings of the Euchariſt broached a new Hereſie in the Church, can we ſupppoſe, that *S. Auguſtine* (who purpoſely, & elaborately wrot of other mens hereſies) would haue bene ſilent in ſo important a matter?

A fourth Caution, which partly conſpireth with the former, is: That we are to obſerue, what Fathers in any age, haue liued in any ſtrait entercourſe of friendſhip together, eyther by writing, or otherwiſe. For we are to preſume, that the Faith of one of ſuch (if the contrary appeare not by wryting of eyther ſide) was agreable to the faith of the other. Seeing then, that *S. Auguſtine* was

tyed

tyed most firmly in freindship with *S. Ambrose* (whose Testimonyes touching the Eucharist, are acknowledged for vs, euen by the Sacramentaries) how can it be probably presumed, that *S. Augustine* should dissent from him in so high a Mysterie, and yet no note, or remembrance thereof left in the monuments, and writings of either of them? How can it be (I say) that they should mainly dissent in faith, since vnity of faith was the band of their most freindly agrement? Or that they should be Heretickes one to another, when their mutuall profession of being scourges of Heretickes, gaue the first cementation, and strenghtening to their inuiolable amity? Or finally (if we will belieue credible Authours) how could they so conspiringly, and vnanimously (as if but one Soule had informed two Bodyes) haue sayd in that diuine Hymme of theirs, *Te Deum laudamus, Te Dominũ confitemur*, if there had bin any disparity in theyr worship of God, or different confession of him, as their Lord?

The Fifth, and last Caution, which I will heere deliuer, is to weigh, whether the actions recorded by any Father do rather sort to the doctrine of the Catholiks touching the Reall Presence, or to the opinion of the Sacramentaryes, since the Fathers approbation of any such workes, doth sufficiently warrant in theyr Iudgements the fayth wherunto such actions are truly appropriated. Thus answerably heerto we find, that *S. Augustine lib. 22. de Ciuit. Dei. c.* 8. reporteth, that a certaine (a) house infested with wicked spirits, was deliuered of the said spirits, through the offering vp of the Sacrifice of the Body of Christ (as this holy Father there saith) by certaine Priests thither sent. Now heere he saith not, that the particuler prayers of the Priests freed the house of them, neither

neither can we thinke, that, that Learned Doctour beleiued the sacrificing of a litle bread, and wine to worke such stupendious effects; but he plainly affirmeth, that this great Miracle was performed by the offering vp of Christs Body, and Bloud; Therefore it followeth euen ἀποδεικτικῶς, and demonstratiuely, that *S. Augustine* beleiued, that Christs Body, and Bloud was truly, and really in the celebration of the Eucharist.

And thus much touching these Obseruations. And now I will end this Chapter, affirming that in regard of what hath beene deliuered in this second Part, we may be the more bold to reproue the precipitate, and wilfull blindnesse of the Sacramentaries, who (by reason of some few scattered darke passages found in the Fathers) are not ashamed to vociferate, and crye mainly out with *Dioscorus* the Hereticke in the Councell of *Chalcedon*: *We defend the opinions of the Fathers*; *We haue their Testimonyes, not by snatches, or at the second hand, but vttered in their owne Bookes*; *Wee are cast out with the holy Fathers*: whereas indeed, these vauntes are as farre from being iustified, as their beliefe herein is distant from our Catholike beliefe.

(a) *House infested*] The words of *S. Augustine* in that place are these: *One Hesperius hauing his house infested with wicked spirits, to the affliction of his beasts, and seruants, desired in my absence certaine of our Priests, that some would goe thither &c. One went, and offered there the Sacrifice of the Body of Christ, praying what he might, that the vexation might cease, and God being thereupon mercifull, it ceased.*] Thus *S. Augustine*.

THAT BY THE

CONFESSIONS

OF THE

Most learned Protestants, the Fathers do teach the Reall Presence.

CHAP. X.

WEE (a) read, that as through Gods permissiõ, the Arke was for the tyme with-houlden by the *Philistians*; so through the sweetnesse of his Prouidence (which euer worketh good out of euill, as he once did Light (b) out of Darknesse) it was in the end safely restored to Israel. The like may we say of the writings of those primitiue Fathers, which (next to the Sacred Scriptures) may be termed the Arke, or Tabernacle, wherin do lye entreasured the riches of the Euangelicall Law. Of this Arke our Aduersaries would seeme in the begin-

beginning to haue impatronized themselues (I meane in their owne vaunts, and in the Eye of the vnlearned, not of the Iudicious) but not being able to make good their supposed title therto, and frustrated of their expected gaine therby; they are at the last pleased to relinquish all such vsurped interest, and freely to surrender it to the true Israelites of the Catholike Church.

This shalbe heere made euident (to omit what hath bene already deliuered) euen hy the vncoacted, and voluntary confessions of the Sacramentaries; who absolutely disclayming in this great Controuersie from the Fathers, as being chiefe Patrons of our Catholike Faith heerin, do betrample their Writings, and Testimonies with an vnaccustomed contempt, and scorne: charging both them, and the tymes wherin they liued with great superstition concerning the same. Thus we see, how our fastidious, and delicate Sectarie, weary still of plodding on the common path, and tract of faith (though beaten with a continuall practise of Gods Church, and a Generall Warrant of the Fathers since the Apostles) delighteth himselfe (according to that ἡ ποικιλία τέρπει) with certaine Deuiations, and By-wayes of Innouation, & Nouelty; since this (saith he) begetteth a manu-mission, & freedome of his vnderstanding vnworthily heertofore enthralled to the iudgments of the Papists Church, and Fathers.

But to proceed. I will produce (as I said) in this point the Sacramentaries owne words (so shall the Enemy wound the Enemy, and Truth receaue a strenthening from her impugners) wherin they most fully acknowledge in behalfe of vs Catholikes, that the Fathers did ioyntly teach our now professed faith of the Euchariſt.

rist. Which kind of proofe both by their owne (c) Assertions, as also euen in reason it selfe is auayleable: since as a Testimony of a friend, against a friend, so of an Aduersarie for an Aduersary is most conuincing.

Now that the Fathers in this weighty Controuersy are on our side, shall appeare foure seuerall wayes by the plaine confession of our Aduersaries; in the vnfolding whereof by certaine steppes, & degrees, I will (in part) retaine my former prescribed Method. First then this shall appeare, in that the Fathers taught the reseruation of the Eucharist. Secondly, the Adoration of the same. Thirdly, that it was a true, and perfect Sacrifice offered to God for the expiation of our sinnes; all which three points doe potentially, and necessarily include our Catholike doctrine. Fourthly and Lastly, that euen in direct, and plaine words they taught the Reall Presence, and Transubstantiation. All which shallbe proued euen from the Sacramentaries owne pennes.

And First, touching *Reseruation*, which most consequently implyes the Reall Presence, since if the Eucharist be nothing else but Bread, and Wyne, to what end is it to be reserued? especially considering the Doctrine of our Sacramentaries, who (d) teach, that this Sacrament consisteth only in action; to wit, during the tyme of celebrating, distributing, and eating it: which being expired, they say, that the Bread, and Wyne then ceaseth to be any longer the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Now the Fathers in this point of Reseruation are charged by diuers. And first *Kemnitius* (that insolent Iudge of his owne Iudges) acknowledgeth this point, saying: (e) *Witnesses of this custome of priuate Reseruation of the Eucharist, are Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Hierome, Basil &c.*

He

He also in the same place saith; *That certaine of the Fathers greatly commended the Reseruation of the Sacrament.* And finally there concludeth saying; that it was, *Antiqua consuetudo, latè patens, & diu propagata.*

Caluin (f) saith: That the *Reseruation of the Sacrament* is *veteris Ecclesiæ exemplum*: *An Example of the ancient Church.*

The *Centuriists* (g) do reprehend the Ancient Fathers for the Doctrine of Reseruation, and withall they (h) shew, that it was the *Viaticum* of such as were sicke; which point euidently argueth the doctrine of Reseruation.

That it was a *Viaticum* for the sicke, is further confessed by *Monsieur* (*) *Casaubon*. *Cartwright* in his second Reply (i) thus censureth *S. Iustin* for this point: *Iustins saying of Deacons carrying the bread of the Holy Supper of the Lord, is contrary to the Institution.*

Doctor Fulke (k) confesseth no lesse freely in these words: *That the Sacrament was reserued in the elder dayes of the Church, is not so great a Controuersy as whether it ought to be reserued.* To conclude, this point is so cleare, as that *Cyril ad Calosyrium* condemneth the *Anthropomorphites*, as Hereticks, for denying the Reseruation of the Eucharist. And therefore he is deepely reprehended for so doing by *Peter* (l) *Martyr*, who saith thereof thus: *Ea consuetudo, etsi saperet nonnihil superstitionis &c. Though that custume of Reseruation may seeme somwhat to tast of superstition, yet did* Cyril, *and others subscribe therto.*] And *Martyr* there further thereof: *Statim enim ab Apostolorum temporibus &c. Presently after the tymes of the Apostles, men did degenerate from that ancient simplicity of the Diuine worship.*] So euident a thing (we see) it is, that the Fathers

euen by the confessions of our Aduersaries did teach the reseruation of the Eucharist. Which thing being granted, and consisting chiefly in practise (which might well descend from Age, to Age) whether is it not more probable, that the Fathers aboue censured, some of them liuing but fifty, or threescore yeares after the Apostles, should be better informed of the Apostles vse heerin, then these vpstarts, who appeare aboue fifteene hundred yeares after the Apostles.

Concerning the second point, which is *Adoration of the Sacrament*, the Fathers euen in our Aduersaries iudgments rest chargeable therin. Which doctrine (as I haue shewed aboue) implicitly inuolues in it selfe the doctrine of the Reall Presence; for seeing we cannot imagine, that they would ascribe any Adoration to Bread, and Wine (still belieuing it to be but bread, and wine) we must assure our selues, that they exhibited this adoration to the Eucharist, as belieuing, that vnder those externall formes did lye the true Body of Christ accompanyed with his Diuinity.

Now, touching our Aduersaries censuring the Fathers, as faulty heerin; we find, that wheras *Nazianzen* (m) telleth of his sister *Gorgonia* (a testimony heertofore by vs alleaged) how she (afore being dangerously sicke) prostrating her selfe before the Altar, and calling vpon him who is worshipped theron, departing (not without Miracle) presently receauing health. Which place *Doctour* (n) *Fulke* not acknowledging, nor denying, cōcludeth thus: *Eucharistia in altari &c. The Eucharist vpon the Altar was not worshipped of her, although it was had in great reuerence, and perhaps not without superstition.*] Thus *D. Fulke*. Which denying-granting Answere of his, well

disco-

discouereth, what he thought of *Gorgonia's* action heerin. This action of *Gorgonia* is also reprehended by *Peter Martyr* (as I shewed afore) *lib. contra Gardiner*.

In like sort we find, that *S. Ambrose* is controlled for the adoration of the Eucharist by the *Centuristes*, who speaking of *Ambroses* prayers *in orat. praparat. ad Missam*, say: (o) *Continent adorationem Panis in Sacramento. They contayne the Adoration of Bread in the Sacrament.*

Chemnitius (p) also setteth downe seuerall sentences of *Nazianzen*, *Ambrose*, & *Augustine*, pronouncing therupon, *that in his iudgment they contayne the Adoration of the Sacrament*. *Iohn Fox* (q) writeth touching the Antiquity of this point of Adoration, that if *Honorius* (who liued anno 1220.) *did not bring it in, we cannot find it to come in by another*. Now that *Honorius* did not begin it, appeareth out of al the former Testimonies alledged therin.

To conclude this point, *S. Basil* speaking of vnwritten Traditions, saith: *Verba inuocationis, dum ostenditur panis Eucharistiæ, & poculum Benedictionis, quis Sanctorum scripto nobis reliquit?*] Which place hauing reference to the particuler words of Adoration, is acknowledged, & reprehended by *D. Fulke* (r): so true it is, that the Fathers by the confessions of the Sacramentaries taught the doctrine of the adoration of the Eucharist.

Touching the third Branch, that is, that the Eucharist was in the iudgment of the Fathers (whose Testimonies to that end are already afore alledged) a true, and perfect *Sacrifice*, euen by the acknowledgmēt of our Aduersaries; we find that the *Carthage* Councell, wherat *S. Augustine* was present, and subscribed, teacheth the Sacrifice of the Masse, and therfore is controlled therin by the (s) *Centuristes* who thus write: *Hic Canon* &c. *This*

Canon

Canon, if it be not forged, sheweth, that euen in that tyme, Prayers, & Oblations for the dead were made.] Where by the word *Oblations*, they meane the Sacrifice of the Masse.

S. Ambrose in like manner is charged by the *Centuristes* (t) in these word s *Ambrosius locutionibus vtitur &c. vt Missam facere, offerre Sacrificium. Ambrose* vsed those kind of speaches &c. as for example, to say Masse, or offer vp Sacrifice.

Gregory Nyssen is also reprehended by *Crastouius* (u) a Protestant, for mantaining the doctrine of the Sacrifice in these words: *An ignoramus opinionem Nysseni &c. Are we ignorant, that the opinion of Nyssen is of it selfe absurd, who said, that when Christ gaue his body to his disciples to eate, that then his body was latently, ineffably, and inuisibly sacrificed vp?*] This Father is also for the same point reprehended by *D.* (x) *Whitaker*.

S. Cyril of *Ierusalem* is charged by *Hospinianus* (y) in this sort: *Quod ad Cyrillum Hierosolymitanum attinet &c. As concerning Cyril of Ierusalem, he indeed affirmed, according to the custome of his tyme, that the Sacrifice of the Altar was a great help of the soules.*

S. Cyprian is deeply reproued for his doctrine herein by the *Centuristes* (z) in these words: *Sacerdotem inquit &c. Cyprian saith that the Priest doth enioy the place of Christ, and offereth sacrifice to God the Father.*] In like sort, *D. Fulke* (a) saith of him: *It is granted, that Cyprian thought the Bread, and Wyne, brought forth by Melchisedech, to be a figure of the Sacrament, and that herein also Melchisedech resembled the Priesthood of Christ.*]

Tertullian receaues this Censure from the *Centuristes*: (b) *Tertullianus approbauit &c. Tertullian did approue oblations (or Sacrifices) for the dead &c.*]

Ireneus

Irenæus also hath his doome from the said *Centuriſts*: (c) *De Oblatione porrò Irenæus ſatis &c. Furthermore Irenæus is thought to ſpeake ouer incommodiouſly of Oblation, when he ſaith, that Chriſt did teach a new Oblation of the New Teſtament, the which the Churc hreceauing from the Apoſtles, doth offer vp to God throughout the whole world.*]

To conclude, *S. Ignatius*, the Apoſtles vndoubted Scholler, is traduced by the (d) *Centuriſts*, as fauouring this doctrine: thus they write of him. *Quædam ambigua, & incommodè dicta &c. Certaine things occurre in this Fathers writings, which are ambiguous, and incommodiouſly ſpoken, as in the Epiſtle of* Ignatius *ad* Smyrnenſes: *where* Ignatius *ſayth, that it is not lawfull without a Biſhop neither to offer, nor to immolate a Sacrifice.*] In this ſort the *Centuriſts* in another (e) place ſay of *Ignatius*, that his words touching this Doctrine are *periculoſa, & quaſi errorum ſemina.*

Thus we ſee, how euery particuler Father is particulerly charged heerwith: yet *Caluin* euen with one (f) Sentence condemnes diuers of them at once, who thus writeth: *Veteres quoq; illos video &c. And I ſee, that thoſe Ancient Fathers did wreſt otherwiſe the memory hereof (meaning of the Lords Supper) then was agreeing to the Inſtitution of our Lord; for their Supper maketh ſhew of an iterated, or at leaſt renewed Sacrifice &c. for they haue imitated more neerely the Iewiſh manner of Sacrifiſing, then either Chriſt ordeyned, or the Ghoſpell could well ſuffer.*] And in another (g) place, *Caluin* thus proceedeth: *Solenne eſt nebulonibus iſtis &c. It is an accuſtomed manner with theſe Knaues* (ſo raylingly he tearmes the Catholikes) *to ſcrape together, what faults ſoeuer they find in reading the Fathers. Therefore when they obiect, that the place of Malachy is expounded by Irenæus*

of the Sacrifice of the Masse; and the Oblation of Melchisedech in like sort is so interpreted by Athanasius, Ambrose, Augustine, Arnobius: I answere in few wordes, that the same Writers do also in other places understand by bread, the body of Christ, but so ridiculously, as both Reason, & Truth force vs to dissent from them.] Thus *Caluin*.

Neither do we find *Kēnitius* (h) to be much lesse sparing in censuring the Fathers concerning this point; for he thus pronounceth of them: *Neq; Veterum quales cunq; sententiæ* &c. *Neither in this Controuersie the sentences of the ancient Fathers, but the Canonicall Scripture is to be the Rule, and Square of faith.*] And againe, reprehending the Fathers for calling the Eucharist a Sacrifice, he saith; that the so naming of it, is, *de Nænis quorundam Veterum*.

And thus much concerning our Aduersaries charging the Fathers of euery age, euen from the Apostles to *S. Augustine* (euen insimulating *S. Augustine* himselfe within the same supposed Errour,) with the doctrine of the Sacrifice. And therfore no meruayle, if *Sebastianus* (i) *Francus*, an eminent Protestant, did peremptorily pronounce, that, *Statim post Apostolos* &c. *Presently after the Apostles all things are turned vpside downe, the Supper of the Lord is transformed into a Sacrifice.*] And yet *Hospinian* not content heerwith proceedeth further saying: (k) *Iam tum primo illo sæculo, & viuentibus adhuc Apostolis* &c. *The Diuell in the very first age, and when the Apostles were yet liuing, gaue subtily more to this Sacrament, then to Baptisme, and by litle, and litle withdrew Men from the first forme therof.*] And thus far of the Protestants acknowledgment of the Fathers minds, touching this point of the Sacrifice.

Now to come to the last Point, which is to shew out

of

of the Protestāts Writings, that the Fathers did in plaine, and direct wordes, without the help of any inferences, (though neuer so immediate, and necessary) teach the doctrine of the Reall Presence. First then (to omit *Gregory* the *Great*, as not being within the first fiue hundred yeares, condemned by Doctour *Humfrey* heerin) we find *S. Chrysostome* reprehended by the (m) *Centuristes*, because *Transubstantiationem videtur confirmare*.

In like sort *Eusebius Emyssenus* is charged by the *Centuristes*, in that (n) *Parùm commodè de Transubstantiatione dixit*: He spake vnprofitably of Transubstantiation.

Neither doth *S. Ambrose* (o) escape the like rebuke of the *Centuristes*, since he is affirmed by thē in the bookes of the Sacraments ascribed to *Ambrose*, *to confirme the doctrine of Transubstantiation*, which Father for the very same is taxed by (p) *Oecolampadius*.

S. Cyril in like manner is heynously traduced by *Peter Martyr* for his doctrine of the Reall Presence, for thus *Martyr* saith: (q) *I will not so easily subscribe to Cyril, who affyrmed such a Communion, as therby euen the substance of the Flesh and Bloud of Christ is ioyned to the blessing, for so he calleth the holy bread* &c.]

Martyr also (r) in another place thus saith: *The Heresie of Cyril touching our Communion with Christ*.] As also in a third (s) place, he further reproueth the doctrine of *Cyril*, and of diuers other Fathers in this point.

S. Cyprian also is charged in the booke ascribed to *Vrsinus*, intituled, *Commonefactio cuiusdam Theologi de sancta Cœna*: who there (t) writeth thus: *In Cyprian are many things, which seeme to affirme Transubstantiation*.] And hence it is, that the Sermon of Cyprian *de Cœna Domini*, wherin he writeth so fully in defence of Transub-

stantiation is said by our Aduersaries to be but counterfait; And yet notwithstanding *D. Fulke* against the *Rhemish* (u) Testament acknowledgeth the authour thereof to be in the time not much inferiour to *Cyprian*, and there produceth Authority out of the same Booke. Lastly *Ignatius* is acknowledged by (x) *Kemnitius* to haue confirmed the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, in that eminent place of his, *Eucharistias, & Oblationes non admittunt &c.* already herefore alledged.

Now seeing the voluntary Confessions of our Aduersaries concerning the Fathers Iudgements in this point, are so cleare, I cannot but approue the ingenuous, playne, and impoliticke dealing of some other Protestants, who in regard of the truth hereof freely confesse the further Antiquity of this Doctrine. And according hereto we find, that *Antony de* (y) *Adamo* (a markeable Protestant) saith: *I haue not hitherto beene able to know, when this Opinion of the Reall, and Bodily being of Christ in the Eucharist did first beginne.*] And in like sort *Adamus* (z) *Francisci* (another Protestant) confesseth no lesse thereof, saying: *Commentum Papistarum &c. The Papists Inuention, touching Transubstantiation crept early into the Church.*]

Thus haue I heere set downe the Fathers Iudgments in this high Mysterie, confessed by the most Learned (though to their owne Preiudice) of our Aduersaries by the foure former wayes; to wit, by acknowledging, that the Fathers did teach the Reseruation, the Adoration, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist (each of these necessarily inuoluing our Catholike Faith) and lastly, the Conclusion it selfe, in playne, direct, and literall words. Wherefore if any of the Sacramentaries shall seeme to

haue

haue iust reason, to vse hereat the complaint of that Apostata (a) *Anti-Constantine*; I meane, *Lucian*: *We are wounded with our owne quilles, out of our bookes they take armour, which in fight they vse against vs.*] Let such remember, that Truth hath a Soueraignty, and Influence ouer a Mans Penne; forcing her Enemyes at vnawares euen in impugning her, to defend her (for so our Sectaryes doe mightily strenghten this our Catholike Faith, when in refuting of it, they acknowledge the Fathers to be our chiefest Patrons) and extorting at their hands the like benefit, which *Prometheus Thessalus* (recorded by *Plutarch*) had receaued from his capitall Aduersarie, who in fight intending to kill him, launced only with his sword a most dangerous mole, or wenne, and so thereby without any further hurt restored him to his more perfect health.

But as heere I haue deliuered the Protestants Assertion, to wit, that the Fathers of the Primitiue Church did with a full consent maintaine the Reall Presence; so I take it not impertinent heere to set downe briefly another Position, to wit; That the Primitiue Church did neuer ioyntly erre in Faith, and Religion. Which Proposition is most true both in reason it selfe, and by the acknowledgment of our Aduersaries. In Reason, for seing that Christ founded his Church with such solicitude, as he did, and being founded, did water it (for it encrease, and continuance) with the shedding of his own most precious Bloud, and the Bloud of infinite Martyrs during these Primitiue tymes; can it stand with his diuine, and benigne Prouidence, presently after his Ascension, or at the most vpon the death of his Apostles, to abandon his former care had therof? Or shall we imagine him so vnkind, and vnmercifull (who through a mer-

cifull kindneſſe was content corporally to dye, to preuene our eternall death) as inſtantly then to repudiate his moſt deare, and chaſt Spouſe, by ſuffering an vtter diſparition, and vaniſhing away of the true Faith? By the acknowledgment of the Proteſtants the former Aſſertion is alſo moſt true, as ſhall euidently appeare out of their owne words, from the Reference (b) appropriated to this place. Now theſe two Propoſitions (to end this Chapter withall) I will combyne, and incorporate togeather in this one Argument, wherby our Aduerſaries may more clearly diſcerne the ineuitable, and dangerous reſultancy, iſſuing from ſuch their confeſſed (yet true) Aſſertions. Thus then:

Whatſoeuer the Primitiue Church did iointly teach in matter of Fayth, the ſame is by the confeſſion of the Proteſtants moſt true.

But the Primitiue Church did iointly teach, by the confeſſion of the Proteſtants, the Doctrine of the Reall Preſence.

Therfore, the Doctrine of the Reall Preſence, is, by the confeſſion of the Proteſtants, moſt true.

The *Propoſitiõ* is acknowledged by our Sectaries in the Marginall Reference. The *Aſſumption* is aboũdantly confeſſed by them throughout this whole Chapter (for it cãnot be denyed, but that doctrine, which was taught by all the chiefeſt, & learned Fathers of the Primitiue Church, was the generally taught, and receaued Doctrine, and Faith of thoſe Ages, and Tymes) therfore the Concluſion is moſt truly, and neceſſarily inferred. And thus my nyce Proteſtant Reader, if ſo his ſtomake can endure the the taſt of an Argument, hath heere a *Compound* (to wit, that the Doctrine of the Reall Preſence, is by the confeſſion

sion of the Protestants, most true) made of the mixture or the two former *Simples*.

(a) *We read.*] 1. Samuel 5, & 6.

(b) *Light out of Darkneſſe.*] 2. Cor. 4.

(c) *Their owne Aſſertions,*] For Doctour *Whitaker de Eccleſ. controuerſ. 2. quæſt. 5. cap. 14.* ſaith: *Firmum ſit neceſſe Argumentum illud quod ſumitur ex Aduerſariorum confeſſione &c.*

(d) *Who teach.*] So writeth *M. Willet in Synopſi Papiſmi. p. 460.* beſides, it is the common doctrine of all the Proteſtants. *M. Willet* words are: *It is no Sacrament except it be receaued.*

(e) *Saying: Witneſſes.*] Examen. part. 2. pa. 102.

(f) *Caluin ſaith.*] Inſtit. 4. c. 17. §. 39.

(g) *The Centuriſts.*] Cent. 4. col. 427.

(*) *Monſieur Caſaubon.*] Who in his Epiſtle to *Cardinall Peron*, writeth, that *Patres Concilij Niceni, & tota Antiquitas &c.* The Fathers of the Nycene Councell, & all Antiquity did miniſter the Eucharist to the ſicke, and in that reſpect did call it their *Viaticum*.

(h) *They ſhew.*] Cent. 4. col. 878.

(i) *Second Reply.*] part. 2. p. 77.

(k) *D. Fulke confeſſeth.*] Againſt *Heskins, Sanders* &c. pag. 77.

(l) *By Peter Martyr.*] Lib. aduerſus *Gardinerum de Euchariſt.* col. 838. printed at *Baſil*.

(m) *Nazianzen telleth.*] Orat. 11. de Sorore *Gorgonia*.

(n) *D. Fulke.*] Reſponſ. ad *Stapleton.* de ſucceſſ. Eccleſ. pag. 230.

(o) *Continent adorationem.*] Cent. 4. col. 430.

(p) *Kemnitius alſo.*] Exam. part. 2. pag. 92.

(q) *Fox wryteth.*] Act. Mon. pag. 896.

(r) *By M. Fulke.*] In his Reioynder to *Briſtow*. p. 681.

(s) *The Centuriſts.*] Cent. 4. pag. 10. there ſpeaking of the 79. Canon of the fourth Councell.

(t) *Centuriſts.*] Cent. 4. c. 4. col. 295.

(u) *Craſſonius.*] Lib. de opificio Miſſæ. Sect. 164.

(x) *Doctour Whitaker.*] contra *Duræum.* l. 4. pag. 320.

(y) *Hoſpinianus.*] 1. Sacrament. pag. 167.

(z) *The Centuriſts.*] Cent. 3. c. 4. col. 83.

(a) *D. Fulke ſaith.*] Againſt *Heskins, Sanders* &c. pag. 100.

(b) *The Centuriſts.*] Cent. 3. l. 1. c. 3.

(c) *The*

(c) *The said Centuriſts.*] cent. 2. c. 4. col. 63.
(d) *By the Centuriſts.*] cent. 2. c. 4. col. 63.
(e) *Another place.*] Cent. 2. c. 10. col. 167.
(f) *With one ſentence.*] Inſtit. l. 4. c. 18.
(g) *Another place.*] lib. de vera Eccleſ. reformat.
(h) *Kemnitius.*] pag. 798.
(i) *Sebaſtianus Francus.*] lib. de abrogandis in vniuerſum omnibus ſtatutis Eccleſ.
(k) *Iam tum primo.*] in Hiſtor. Sacram. l. 1. c. 6.
(l) *By D. Humfrey.*] In Ieſuitiſmi part. 2. rat. 5.
(m) *The Centuriſts.*] Cent. 3. col. 517.
(n) *Parùm commodè.*] Cent. 4. c. 10. col. 985.
(o) *Ambroſe eſcape.*] Cent. 4. c. 4. col. 295.
(p) *By Oecolampadius.*] Lib. epiſt. Oecolampad. & Zuinglij l. 3.
(q) *I will not ſo eaſily.*] *Peter Martyr* l. Epiſtol. epiſt. ad *Bezam*, annexed to his Common places.
(r) *In another place.*] In his ſecond Alphabeticall Table (annexed to his Common places) of the Additions vnder the letter H. at the word *Hereſy*.
(s) *In a third place.*] Epiſt. ad *Caluinum*.
(t) *There writeth.*] pag. 211. & 218.
(u) *The Rhemiſh Teſtament.*] in 1. Cor. c. 11.
(x) *By Kemnitius.*] Exam. part. 1. pag. 94.
(y) *Antony de Adamo.*] In his Anatomie of the Maſſe pag. 236.
(z) *Adamus Franciſci.*] In margarita Theolog. pag. 256.
(a) *Anti-Conſtantyne.*] Thus *Theodoret* recordeth *Iulian* to ſay l. 3. c. 8.
(b) *From the Reference appropriated.*] Anſwerably hereto we find, that *Iewell* in his defence of the *Apology* thus ſaith: *The Primitiue Church, which was vnder the Apoſtles, and Martyrs, hath euermore beene accounted the pureſt of all others without exception.* *Kemnitius* ſaith in his Exam. Conc. Tridet. part. 1. pag. 74. *We doubt not, but that the Primitiue Church receaued from the Apoſtles, and Apoſtolicall Men, not only the Text of Scripture, but alſo the right, and natiue ſenſe thereof.* And in the ſame part he alſo ſaith: *We are greatly confirmed in the true, and ſound ſenſe of Scripture, by the teſtimony of the Ancient Church.* Doctor *Saraiua* in defenſ. tract. de diuerſis Miniſtrorum gradibus pag. 8. writeth: *Spiritus Sanctus (qui in Eccleſia præſidet) verus eſt Scripturarum interpres: ab eo igitur eſt petenda vera interpretatio, & cum ſe ſibi non poſſit eſſe contrarius, qui primitiuæ Eccleſiæ præſedit, & per*

per Episcopos eam gubernauit, ipsos iam abijcere consentaneum veritati non est. In like sort the Confession of *Bohemia*, in the Harmony of Confessions *pag.* 400. acknowledgeth, that, *The Ancient Church is the true, and best Mistresse of Posterity, and going before leadeth vs the way.* Finally *Doctor Bancroft* speaking of *Caluin*, and *Beza*, thus writeth in his *Survey* of the *pretended Holy Discipline*: *For M. Caluin, and M. Beza, I doe thinke of them, as their writings doe deserue, but yet I thinke better of the ancient Fathers, I must confesse.* All which prayses, and commendations giuen by so many of our Aduersaries to the Primitiue Church, and the Fathers of those Ages, are vnworthily, wrongfully, and vntruly applyed, if so the Church of that Tyme, or the Fathers therof should haue generally erred in matter of faith.

Of

OF CERTAINE CONSIDERATIONS

Drawne from Luther, *the* Lutherans, *and other Protestants, teaching the doctrine of the Eucharist.*

CHAP. XI.

HAVING in the former Chapter proued euen frō the Testimonies of our Aduersaries (so receauing from them therby a benefit, but not a courtesie) that the ancient Fathers (though most remote frō vs in circūstance of Place, and Tyme) were neuertheless consspiring with vs in faith, & beliefe of the Eucharist, and therfore altogeather opposite to the professed doctrine of the Sacramentaries, *Thus the Fathers God is not as our Aduersaries God, euen our (*) Enemies being Iudges*: It will not

not in this place seeme (I hope) inconuenient, if I present to the Readers iudgment two obseruations; the deliberate consideratiõs wherof (though but Morall inducements) are able to obtund, and blunt the most forcible reasons vrged to the contrary.

The first of these shalbe taken from *Luther*, whose malice towards the Pope (for indeed he breathed nothing but Malice, Pride, and Lust) was so implacable, as that he endeauoured by all meanes possible to annoy, and endomage the Sea of Rome; and therupon (as the World knoweth) he did burst out from the Catholike Church, by denying the most poynts denyed at this day by the Protestants. Hence now I would demaund, how chanced, that he changed not his opinion in the Article of the Reall Presence, aswell as in the rest, since the detriment comming to the Pope by this meanes, must haue beene very markeable; and far extending, for it would haue brought in an Innouation of the externall, & daily worship of God throughout all Christendome? Truly we can assigne no other reason, but that the euidency of the Euangelists, and the Apostles Texts (for (a) himselfe of this point confesseth no lesse) was so vnauoydable, as that he could pretend no colour of dissenting from the Church of Rome heerin. And so being heere conuinced with the perspicuity of Christs owne words, was constrayned to acknowledge him to be in the Eucharist, no otherwise then the Diuells ouercome with Christs Miracles, euen forcedly noysed him to be the (b) Sonne of the Liuing God. Thus we see, that out of an impartiality of iudgment (which in other matters was darkened with passion) he heere was compelled to maintayne the same Doctrine, which was maintayned by his designed Ene-

my; In defence whereof we may easily discouer his feruour, by his acerbity of writing against the *Zuinglians* in these words: *We* (c) *censure in earnest the Zuinglians, and all the Sacramentaries for Heretiks, and alienated from the Church of God.*] And againe: *Cursed* (d) *be the Charity, and Concord of the Sacramentaries for euer, and euer to all eternity.*]

To the Iudgement of *Luther* I will subordinate the iudgement of his owne brood (the *Lutherans*) euer since his time, who (though according with the Caluinists, and Zuinglians in many of the other points controuerted betweene them, and the Catholikes) with greater earnestnes haue euer maintained the doctrine of the Reall Presence: Witnesse hereof are their long continued (e) Booke-warres, their Proscriptions, their Banishments, and other temporall dishonors, wherewith they afflict one the other, and all vndertaken originally, and primatiuely for iustifying of Christs corporall, and reall being in the Sacrament. Now the Motiue of the Lutherans Agreement with the Catholikes herein, cannot be deriued from any frendly association betweene vs, and them; for we see, that not only in most other Articles, but also in diuers circumstances, and accessorie Inferences vpon this very doctrine, they dissent from vs (as in the manner of the Presence, the Adoration, the Sacrifice &c.) and therefore we may assure our selues, that it is the euidency of Gods word, attended on with an answerable practise of the Primitiue Church, and a ioyne consent of the Fathers, which did force their iudgements herein, and hath made them such resolute, and constant Propugners of the Reall Presence.

The second Obseruation (to passe ouer the former acknow-

acknowledged doctrine of the Reall Presence, taught by the most eminent Deuines of *England*, as appeareth in my Epistle to his Maiesty, & the other to the Reader, whose Position therin seemes more Catholike, then that of those hereafter alledged) whereupon I will heere rest, shall be drawne from such our Aduersaries, who, though they imbrace not the truth of Christs Reall Being in the Sacrament to the bodily Mouth, yet they altogeather disauow, and reiect the common doctrine of the Sacramentaries, and so (as if the verity hereof did partake of a Morall vertue, to be bounded on ech side with extremes) they come crowding in with a middle kind of faith, teaching with the Catholikes, that Christ is really, and truly in the Eucharist; and with the Sacramentaries, that his Body is taken only with the mouth of faith.

The doctrine of these Participles in faith (so to tearme such Men) though erroneous, I alledge to this end, to demonstrate hereby, that the luculency, and clearnesse of the Proofes for this our Catholike Belieue, though it hath not (through their owne defaults) that working influence vpon such iudgements, as to draw them entirely, and wholly to the Truth, yet is it able to hinder, that they entertaine not that grosse (yet spirituall) mistaking of the Sacramentaries, euen as the Sunne, whose heate sometimes is such, as though it cannot dispell, and consume the vapours neere to it, yet is it of force to preuent, that they thicken not into any darke cloudes of stormes, and tempests.

Diuers Protestants of great eminency (as (f) *Hooker*, *D.* (g) *Whitaker*, and (h) others) haue maintayned this kind of Christs being in the Sacramẽt, & for their so doing, haue bene sharply rebuked by other Protestants,

assenting heerin (to vse their owne wordes) ouermuch to (i) Popery, the particulers of which I haue displayed in the marginall Notes. Yea euen *Caluin* himselfe, (as seeming to allow the former Protestats assertion) yet chiefly out of Policy, the more to countenance his wheaten Comunion, thus bursteth forth into admiration of Gods power, manifested in the Eucharist, saying: *Nihil (k) restat, nisi vt in eius Mysterij admirationē prorumpam, cui nec Mens planè cogitando, nec lingua explicando par esse pateſt.*] So desirous is a *Babylonian* to speake heerof in the Dialect of an *Israelite*. Now the [illegible], or Resultancy of all heertofore deliuered in this Chapter, is, to discouer that both the Lutherans, and infinite others of the most learned, and graue Protestants, do concurre heerin, that the words of Christ, & his great Apostle *S. Paul* (besides other humane authorityes) are so cleare, & euident, for his true, and corporall Presence in the Sacrament, as that no wit whatsoeuer can probably wrest them (and therfore Impudency it selfe might well seeme to blush at such forced Detorsions) to the vphoulding only of a bare, naked, & Typicall Presence. And that, if eyther of these two sorts were demaunded, whose particuler faith among the Christians of this Age, they would admit next to their owne, they both would prefer our Catholike Faith before the Sacramentarian Innouation; for they both participate heerin much more with the Catholikes, then with the Sacramentaries. Out of which we may iustly inferre, that the Faith of the Church of Rome only is true, and vndoubted, and all the rest erroneous; according to that most probable Position: *Cæteræ partes, quæ secta secundas quamlibet diu ferunt, cum singulæ principatum sibi vendicant, melius reliquis videtur* [illegible]

For we must presume, that the first Censure, terminating in their owne Faith, proceedeth out of Preiudice, and Selfe-loue; the other out of a cleere, and impartiall Iudgment.

And heere now I will close vp this Chapter with a discouery of one notorious sleight of the Sacramentaries, which shall serue, as a *Chorus* to this second Tract. It is this; That now at the length they are content to diuulge, that the Article of the Reall Presence, is but a Point adiaphorous, or indifferent, and therfore may be maintayned on all sides without endangering the Foundation of Christian Religion. But what? Doe they thus teach in fauour towards vs, therby to lessen our supposed errour heerin? No verily. This show of kindnesse we admit not, for (1) *Timeo Danaos, & dona ferentes*. The true Reason then heerof is this: They seeing, that Gods sacred word (at least in the litterall, and genuine sense thereof) the vn-interrupted Practise of the Church, the conuincing testimonyes of the Fathers, and finally theyr owne Brethren (though comparting with them in other Articles of theyr owne Religion) do all ioyntly corroborate, and strengthen the Catholike doctrne in this High Mystery. And on the other side, vnwilling to recall (for Pryde cannot brooke a iust yielding, or submission to an Aduersary) what they haue heertofore so pertinaciously defended, they haue therfore thought it good Policy, to suggest to the world, and Indifferency of this Point, that by so doing they may intimate to all, that though they erre therin (as hauing so many great Euidences against them) yet their Errour (not touching any Cardinall, & supreme article of Faith) is the lesse dangerous, and therfore the more sufferable, and pardonable.

Now

Now answerably to this my Asseueration, we find euen *Doctor* (n) *Reynolds*, no vulgar Idoll in our English Temple (to assigne (o) diuers others to the Marginall Reference) to affirme, that the Reall Presence, is but as it were, *the grudging of a former Ague, if otherwise the party hould the Christian faith*. Thus we see how our Aduersaries comportment in this Controuersy is full of fraud, more full of Malice. Their incorrigible humour of contradicting the Catholike Church (for their Sacramentall Position is grounded meerely vpon Opposition) displayes their Malice; their false extenuating (for their owne aduantage) the greatnesse of this Mysterie, their Fraud.

(*) *Euen our Enemyes.*] *Deuteron.* 32.

(a) *Himselfe confesseth.*] to wit, in his epistle *ad Argentinos.*

(b) *The Sonne of the Liuing God.*] *Matth.* 8. *Mar.* 1.

(c) *VVs censure.*] Epistol. contra *Articul. Louan. thes.* 87. *tom.* 2.

(d) *Cursed be.*] *Tom.* 7. *VVittemberg. fol.* 381.

(e) *Continued Booke-warres.*] There hath beene seuerall hundreds of Bookes written by the *Lutherans* against the *Caluinists*, or *Zuinglians*, and by these against the former, and the Subiect of very many of those bookes is only touching the doctrine of the Sacrament. See of this point *Coccius his Thesaurus tom.* 2. *Hospinianus* his *Historia Sacrament. part.* 2. and the yearly Catalogue of Bookes returned from *Franckford*.

(f) *Hooker.*] l. 5. of *Ecclesiasticall Policie sect.* 67.

(g) *D. VVhytaker.*] *Contra Durœum*, pag. 168.

(h) *And others.*] as *Bucer in Script. Anglic.* pag. 548. *The Confession of Belgia in the English Harmonie*, pag. 431. and by diuers others.

(i) *Ouermuch to Poperie.*] So is this their Opinion reprehended by *Peter Martyr* in his Epistles annexed to his Cómon places in English. *epist.* 15. who is for the same reciprocally controlled by *Bucer* in his *Script. Anglic.* p. 548. The same Opinion of Christs existency

existency in the Sacrament is reprehended by our English Puritants in their Christian Letter to *M. R. Hooker*, by *Aretius Serm. 3. de Cœna*: and finally (to omit diuers others) by *Ludouicus Alemannus in positionibus apud Lugdunenses editis Anno 1566*, who thus there writeth hereof: *Neq; etiam per fidem, seu incomprehensibili modo, vt vocant, quia hoc totum imaginarium, & repugnat apertissimè Dei verbo.*

(k) *Nihil restat.*] *l. 4. Instit. c. 17. §. 7.*

(l) *Timeo Danaos.*] *Virg. Aneid. 4.*

(n) *D. Reynolds.*] in his fifth Conclusion annexed to his Conference.

(o) *To assigne diuers others.*] Answerably hereto, we find *Iacobus Acontius l. 3. stratagem. Sat. pag. 135.* thus writing. *It is euident concerning as well those, who hould the Reall Presence of Christs Body in the Bread, as those others, which deny it, that although of necessity the one part doe erre, yet both are in way of Saluation, if in other things they be obedient to God.*] So also the indifferent iudgement of Iohn *Frith*, *Acts. and Mon. 503.* who there saith hereof: *The matter touching the substance of the Sacrament, byndeth no man of necessity to Saluation, or Damnation, whether he belieue it, or no.*

Now answerably to this my Asseueration, we find euen *Doctor* (n) *Reynolds*, no vulgar Idoll in our English Temple (to assigne (o) diuers others to the Marginall Reference) to affirme, that the Reall Presence, is but as it were, *the grudging of a former Ague, if otherwise the party hould the Christian faith*. Thus we see how our Aduersaries comportment in this Controuersy is full of fraud, more full of Malice. Their incorrigible humour of contradicting the Catholike Church (for their Sacramentall Position is grounded meerely vpon Opposition) displayes their Malice; their false extenuating (for their owne aduantage) the greatnesse of this Mysterie, their Fraud.

(*) *Euen our Enemyes.*] Deuteron. 32.

(x) *Himselfe confesseth.*] to wit, in his epistle *ad Argentinos.*

(b) *The Sonne of the Liuing God.*] Matth. 8. Mar. 1.

(c) *VVs censure.*] Epistol. contra *Articul. Louan. thes.* 87. *tom.* 2.

(d) *Cursed be.*] Tom. 7. *VVittemberg. fol.* 381.

(e) *Continued Booke-warres.*] There hath beene seuerall hundreds of Bookes written by the *Lutherans* against the *Caluinists*, or *Zuinglians*, and by these against the former, and the Subiect of very many of those bookes is only touching the doctrine of the Sacrament. See of this point *Coccius his Thesaurus tom.* 2. *Hospinianus* his *Historia Sacrament. part.* 2. and the yearly Catalogue of Bookes returned from *Franckford*.

(f) *Hooker.*] l. 5. of *Ecclesiasticall Policie sect.* 67.

(g) *D. VVhytaker.*] *Contra Durœum*, pag. 168.

(h) *And others.*] as *Bucer in Script. Anglic.* pag. 548. *The Confession of Belgia in the English Harmonie*, pag. 431. and by diuers others.

(i) *Ouermuch to Poperie.*] So is this their Opinion reprehended by *Peter Martyr* in his Epistles annexed to his Comon places in English: *epist.* 15. who is for the same reciprocally controlled by *Bucer* in his *Script. Anglic.* p. 548. The same Opinion of Christs existency

existency in the Sacrament is reprehended by our English Puritants in their Christian Letter to *M. R. Hooker*, by *Aretius Serm. 3. de Cœna*; and finally (to omit diuers others) by *Ludouicus Alemannus in positionibus apud Lugdunenses editis Anno 1568*, who thus there writeth hereof: *Neq; etiam per fidem, seu incomprehensibili modo, vt vocant, quia hoc totum imaginarium, & repugnat apertissimè Dei verbo.*

(k) *Nihil restat.*] *l. 4. Instit. c. 17. §. 7.*

(l) *Timeo Danaos.*] *Virg. Aneid. 4.*

(n) *D. Reynolds.*] in his fifth Conclusion annexed to his Conference.

(o) *To assigne diuers others.*] Answerably hereto, we find *Iacobus Acontius l. 3. stratagem. Sat. pag. 135.* thus writing. *It is euident concerning as well those, who hould the Reall Presence of Christs Body in the Bread, as those others, which deny it, that although of necessity the one part doe erre, yet both are in way of Saluation, if in other things they be obedient to God.*] So also the indifferent iudgement of Iohn *Frith, Acts. and Mon. 503.* who there saith hereof: *The matter touching the substance of the Sacrament, byndeth no man of necessity to Saluation, or Damnation, whether he beleiue it, or no.*

THAT THERE ARE MANY CONGRVENTIALL *Reaſons, ſhewing the Conueniency, why Chriſt might be induced to leaue his Body, and Bloud in the Euchariſt. As alſo ſhewing the Conueniency of* Tranſubſtantiation.

CHAP. XII.

IT is an accuſtomed, & approued Method both of Philoſophers, and Deuines, after they haue fortified their Aſſertions (the ſubiect of their Diſcourſe) with the moſt forcible Teſtimonyes, which are to be alledged in that behalfe, then to attend the ſaid Proofs with certaine *Congruentiall* Inducements, perſwading the conueniency, and fitnes of ſuch their doctrine. Thus the Philoſopher (for inſtance ſake) after he hath

hath much discourſed of the number, the vaſtneſſe, and the beauty of the Heauens (Gods *Hieroglyphick* Characters, wherin are written his Power, and Glory) and deſcending to demonſtrate the roundneſſe of thoſe Bodyes, as alſo the anſwerable roundneſſe of the Earth, from the vnchangeable Motions, *Phainomena*, and Appearances of the Heauens; he ſheweth the ſutableneſſe of this forme of them both, and how it ſorteth to the benefite of all Creatures, and the Irregularities, and exorbitant Effects, riſing from any other ſuppoſed forme giuen to them.

In like ſort, the Diuine conuincing againſt the Arian, that Chriſt is both God, and Man, from the holy Scriptures, and the authority of the Church, doth warrant his doctrine with certaine perſwaſiue motyues, drawne from the conſideration of Gods Iuſtice, and the Atrocity of Sinne; including, that it was conuenient, that ſince Sinne did firſt deuide God from Man, he, who by redeeming the world, ſhould reunite them, ſhould be both God, and Man. And thus the firſter kind forceth our Iudgment; the other, as ſorting with Reaſon, and Prudence, and in ſome ſenſe preſuming the former, ſerues only (as ſweet meates to our ſtomakes) pleaſingly to cloſe vp our iudgment. The ſame order will I heere obſerue: For hauing (I truſt) already ſufficiently proued the Truth of the Reall Preſence in the Euchariſt frō all the former Authorities, drawne from the Word both of God, and Man, I will ſet downe certaine Congruences, and Prudentiall Reaſons, wherwith our Sauiour might well ſeeme to haue bene induced to leaue his Sacred Body to his Church, that by the authority, and diſpoſall therof, it might be truly, and really exhibited

to all Christians whatsoeuer.

And heere by reason of the great number of them, I will chiefly insist in some few (for I am desirous to contract this Treatise within as small a Compasse, as conueniently I can) in regard whereof I will not much more enlarge my selfe vpon those Effects, and Operations of this most heauenly food, which heretofore I haue touched by way of alledging the Fathers Authorities; which shew, that the Eucharist is a Pledge of our Saluation; that by it we are not only by Faith, but euen corporally vnited with Christ; That in regard of this vnion, the Eucharist is a Seale to vs of our Resurrection; finally that through it we are made Partakers of the diuine Nature; All which admirable Effects and vertues, may probably be imagined (among other Motiues) to haue beene most preuayling with our Lord for the first institution of this holy Mysterie; for Man cannot conceaue, how Christ could inuent more forcible meanes to produce such spirituall operations, then by instituting this Sacrament. In respect also of the same desired expedition, I will not long rest in displaying, and amplifying the dignity, and worth of such Inducements, as I intend heere to vrge, but will passe them ouer with a cursory Penne, briefly intimating them to the studious Reader.

Well then, one Inducement of the Institution of this Sacrament may be, that seeing Mortall sinne (which is the Harbinger of eternall damnation) cannot be auoyded altogeather, but by the Grace of God; what better meanes could his diuine Maiesty inuent for the watering our Soules with his Grace, then the ordayning of this Sacrament? for since we are hereby truly, and really vnited with Christ (the Fountaine of Grace) how can we

be

be altogeather estranged, and denided from such Influences, as proceed from Christ? yea we are to believe, that this ioyning of Christ with vs, doth not only enable vs to preuent future Sinnes, but also affoardeth meanes to salue, and medicine other spirituall diseases. Which Effect is worthy to proceed from such a Coniunction, since we read, that the (a) woman in the Ghospell by touching only the hemme of Christs garment, was cured of her corporall sickneſſe.

In like sort, Christ intending to enrich Mans soule with all necessarie, and spirituall knowledge for the auoyding of Sinne, and guyding him in the way of a vertuous life, could not by more conuenient meanes performe this his designe, then by our receauing him within vs, who is knowledge it selfe. For let vs consider his *Humanity*, we find him to be fraught with such a πληροφορία, and fulneſſe of wisdome, as that, *De plenitudine* (b) *eius omnes accepimus*. Let vs ascend higher with respect to him, as to the Second Person in the most Blessed *Trinity*, and we may glasse in him all sufficiency without any blemish of Imperfection, for we are taught, that he is *Lumen de* (c) *Lumine*. Finally, let vs contemplate him in the supreme Maiesty of *Deitie*, and our weake sight is euen dazeled with the rayes of his brightneſſe, since he is that Sunne from whence all reasonable Creatures do deryue their Intellectuall beames. Therefore it must needes follow, that, that Christian, who with due preparation receaueth him in this high Mystery, is much enlightened with spirituall, and heauenly Knowledge; and this not only during that most happy (though short) presence of him within vs, but also for no small season thereafter; euen as we see the Sunne doth leaue vnto vs

for a reasonable tyme, a secondary light after his departure from our *Horizon*.

A second Motiue heerof may be for our increase of *Faith*. For in regard of the many obscurities encompassing the Catholike doctrine heerin on all sides, it followeth, that the Faith of him, who giueth an immoueable assent heerto, is mightily aduanced: for the difficulties in any dogmaticall Point, and a faith of the said Point, may wel resemble a paire of Ballance, wherof how much the lower one part descendeth, so much the higher the other riseth; for so we find, that the greater the difficulties are which depresse our vnderstanding against the belief of any Mysterie, the higher aspireth our faith in belieuing the same. Wherfore in such cases our vnderstanding (especially if we be vnlearned) must afore digest all such subtiltyes with an vnexamined intertainment, free from all inquisitiue rumination of them; no otherwise then in the Old Law the *Paschall Lambe* (an expresse figure of the holy Eucharist) was commaunded to be eaten by (d) swallowing the parts therof downe, without any chewing of the same.

Our *Hope* in like sort is raysed heerby to a higher straine; for since the Obiect of Christian Hope is the Ioyes of Heauen, what greater assurance can we haue of a future accomplishing of our said Hope, then in the meane tyme (as meate giuen to strengthen vs in our spirituall Iourney) to feed vpon him, who is the Lord, and King of Heauen? Or how can we doubt, that we shall not in due time (if our owne demerits do not merit the cõtrary) enioy those riuers of the water of life, when whilest we are heere vpon earth, we drinke the Bloud of our Sauiour, which is the Source, and Well-spring it selfe

selfe? Not without cause therfore did our most gracious Author heerof affirme, that, (e) *Qui manducat meam carnem, & bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam æternam*. Yea one Father is so strong in this point, that he is not afraid to pronounce, that, (f) *Dum in hac vita sumus, vt terra nobis Cælum sit, facit hoc Mysterium*, so as that by the operation, and Presence of the Blessed Eucharist, we enioy Heauen, before we be in Heauen: So true it is, that a confident, and erected Hope is a pleasing anticipation of a future good.

Fourthly who will not acknowledge our *Charity*, and Loue towards our Sauiour to grow more intense, & to become more inflamed heerby? I meane, in contemplating the immensurable Goodnesse of God manifested to vs heerin, who would not only vouchsafe to become Man for Man, but also is content so much to abase himselfe, as to enter (being accompanyed with his Diuinity) into the body of a most sinfull, & wretched Worme; which proceeding of Christ, in that it did flow from an infinite gulfe of Charity towards vs, how can we be so monstrously vngratefull, as not (though in a lower proportion) to meete him with some retaliation of burning zeale? for seeing euen vnreasonable Creatures are heerin so reasonable, as that they shew a liking towards the, of whom they haue receaued any good turnes; much more then with man, should Loue be the vsury of Loue, and Affection euer reflect Affection. And therfore a Christian Soule ought in this place to striue through an height, and extremity of Loue (whose Nature is to incorporate togeather things different) to be most inwardly, and inseparably conioyned with her Creatour, euen dwelling, and residing in him, and so making good

in

in herselfe that saying: *Anima magis est, vbi amat, quàm vbi animat*. And thus farre of these three Theologicall vertues, and how consorting, and sutable the Institution of the Blessed Eucharist is to the progresse, and increase thereof; from which holy Mysterie though these vertues receaue their augmentation, and perfection; yet not their beginning; for we teach (according to that of the Apostle, *Qui* (g) *manducat, & bibit indignè, iudicium sibi manducat, & bibit*) that he, who is altogeather depriued of them, can no more (as being spiritually dead) profitably relish, and tast this celestiall *Manna*, then a Body (naturally dead) can disgest corporall meates.

Another Reason of ordayning the Eucharist, may be to bind all Christians togeather not only by Charity, but euen in a certaine reall, and substantiall manner. Now this vnion is performed, in that all Christians do communicate of one, and the same spirituall food; according to those words of the Apostle (which though immediately they be appropriated to the former vnion of mind by Charity, yet may they well be extended to this more straite, and intrinsecall vnion) *Vnus* (h) *Panis, vnum corpus multi sumus, qui de vno Pane participamus*. Thus doth this Reall vnion of Christians through Christ beget an vnion of them in Charity; and this of Charity (for who loueth truly his Neighbour, loueth Christ) engendreth againe a Secondary vnion of them in Christ: so powerfull, and operatiue is heere this Circulation of vnion.

Sixthly, how could our Sauiour more feelingly expresse a perseuerance of his Loue towards Man, then by leauing at his departure his sacred Body with his Spouse, wherewith the deuout Soule might at all conueniēt times

be

be fedde, and nouriſhed? The immenſenes of which Loue our vnderſtanding cannot comprehend, and therefore we may heere well vſe that forcible word (i) ἐσπλαγχνίσθη of Chriſt (the which the Euangeliſts vpon other occaſions often apply to him) that is, that he was touched euen in his bowells of Loue, and kindneſſe, when he firſt reſolued, and thought vpon (for Loue is moſt inuentiue) to inſtitute this dreadfull Myſterie. For if we conſider the thing heere giuen, or the giuer himſelfe (both being heere coincident, and both being God, and Man) or the end whereunto it was beſtowed, to wit, the ſpirituall nouriſhing of our Soules, or the ſmall deſerning of Man receauing it, who dayly crucifieth him with his ſinnes, it will aſſure vs, that ſuch wonderfull Munificence iſſued from a Sea of moſt vehement Loue, and Affection.

Furthermore his zeale to vs herein appeareth in that he is content by his entring into vs (a ſtrang affection which bringeth forth ſuch ſtrang effects) that we doe enter into him, and thus we are (without any diſordered confuſion of things) in that meate, the which is in vs, himſelfe witneſſing no leſſe in thoſe words: *Qui manducat meam carnem, & bibit meum ſanguinem, in me* (k) *manet, & Ego in eo.*] Therefore to conclude this point, it remayneth (ſince flames euer beget flames) that ſeeing the burning Loue of Chriſt did firſt procure this Coniunction with vs in the Euchariſt, the ſaid Coniunction ought reciprocally to engender in vs a gratefull Loue towards Chriſt for ſo great a benefit, *Ego* (l) *Dilecto meo, & Dilectus meus mihi*, ſtill acknowledging it full worth, and ſtill remaining deſirous by often participation of ſo high a Myſtery, without any faſtidious, or cloyed conceipt

therof to renew all ſpirituall operations flowing from the ſame: *Qui (m) edunt me, adhuc eſurient: & qui bibunt me, adhuc ſitient.*

There are many other Inducements (according to the iudgments of the Learned Fathers, and Doctours) which might inuite our Sauiour to leaue his Body, and Bloud in the Euchariſt; for they teach, that it is a perpetuall Sacrifice euer to continue in the Church: That it is a condigne, and worthy Sacrifice for Chriſt to offer vp to his Father: That it is a Sacrifice of Thankſgiuing for the Saints in Heauen: That it is not only for the Liuing, but for the Dead alſo a Propitiatory Sacrifice: That it is a Commemoration of Chriſts Paſſion: That it is a confirmation of his Teſtament: That it is an Abſtract, or Abridgment of diuers of Gods chiefeſt Myracles: That in a ſort it Deifieth the Soule: That therby we haue God preſent vnder a ſenſible obiect to heare our Prayers, which poynt mightily increaſeth our deuotion, and reuerence: Finally, that it is a *Viaticum* for the ſoules ready to depart out of this world. All which ſeuerall Reaſons (beſides diuers others) if we ſhould inſiſt in vnfoulding the value, and worth of them (of which this place is not capable) might well ſeeme to be moſt important, and vrging occaſions of the inſtitution of this Sacrament; ſince ſuch ſpirituall ends, intendements, operations, & effects (ſuppoſing that Chriſt would eſtabliſh in his Church ſome ſetled courſe tending to the ſame) could not by any other more conuenient, and proportionable meanes be accompliſhed, then by the ordayning of this moſt dreadfull Myſterie; ſo agreeable is our Catholike doctrine heerin to all Prudence, Reaſon, and Morall Perſwaſion. And thus we ſee, how the Inſtitution of this

Sacra-

Sacrament, and the many seeming inducements therof do in a different respect reciprocally presuppose the one the other.

And hence therfore more euidently appeareth the froward obstinacy of our Aduersaries, who eyther not knowing, or not weighing these, and other such Arguments of credibility, alledged in defence of the Reall Presence, are not ashamed to vrge (grounding themselues vpon our Method heerin by way of a Contrariety) the vnprofitableness therof, as also certaine Inconueniences, and Indignityes to Christ, proceeding in their opinion from this our Catholike Doctrine; affirming thē to be such, as that they minister strong probabilityes, that Christ would neuer leaue his Body, and Bloud to be giuen truly, and really in the celebration of the Eucharist. But this their Lightnesse, and want of solide Iudgment, consisting in dishonouring Christ vnder the texture of honouring him (so did the Iewes conuitiate him in words of Reuerence) shalbe discouered (n) heereafter in the Marginall Reference, and their supposed wrongs against Christs sacred Body, solued: The which are not rested vpon by them, for any tender regard had of our Sauiours dignity, and glory, but because they are resolued in all points to be mainly crosse, and contrary to this our Catholike, and ancient Faith; not only touching the Presence, but also the manner therof, which is warranted from (o) Reasons drawne in like sort from Conueniency (for they are strange Mathematicians) since of all the seuerall *Aspects*, which may be borne to the Sunne of Gods Church (for, *in sole posuit Tabernaculum suum*) they approue, and allow only a meere Diametricall *Opposition*: thus (grauely) esteeming themselues

to be so much the neerer to the Truth, by how much they are further of from the (p) Pillar and Foundation of Truth.

(a) *The woman in the Ghospell.*] Marke c. 5.
(b) *De plenitudine eius.*] Iohn cap. 2.
(c) *Lumen de Lumine.*] Symbolum Athanasij.
(d) *By swallowing the parts.*] Exod. c. 12.
(e) *Qui manducat meam carnem.*] Iohn 6.
(f) *Dum in hac vita.*] Chrysostome *homil.* 24. *in prior. ad Corinth.*
(g) *Qui manducat, & bibit indignè.*] 1. Cor. c. 11.
(h) *Vnus Panis.*] 1. Cor. 10.
(i) ἐμβλαγχνισθη.] Matth. 14. Marke 6.
(k) *In me manet.*] Iohn 6.
(l) *Ego dilecto meo.*] Cantic. 6.
(m) *Qui edunt me.*] Eccles. 24.
(n) *Hereafter in the Marginall Reference.*] The chiefe Reasons, which our Aduersaries doe alledge, both from the vnprofitableness of the Catholike doctrine, as also from the indignity, which seemes to be offered to Christs Body, are these following. And first touching the seeming indignity, and dishonour redounding to the sacred body of Christ by the doctrine of the Reall Presence: They obiect, that from our doctrine it followeth, that the Body of Christ might fall, might be burnt, might become rotten, and mouldy (for so we see the externall symboles sometimes to appeare) might be eaten by mice, should passe into the belly, and so to the common passage &c.

To all this we Answere; First, that these supposed Indignities doe not touch the Body of Christ, but only affect the species, and formes of the Eucharist, which are ioyned with the Body. As for example, when the consecrated hoast falleth from the Altar vpon the Earth, yet cannot the Body of Christ be truly said to fall: for that is said properly and truly to fall, which doth exist, and is mooued corporally (which cannot be properly said of Christs Body in the Eucharist.) And therefore when a Man falleth on the ground, we vse not to say, that his Soule falleth, though accidentally it changeth it place therewith. Answerably therefore, we teach, that the Body of Christ existing after a spirituall manner, and indiuisibly in the Eucharist, changeth it place, but properly falleth not, when the Hoast falleth.

Secondly

Secondly, we answere, that seeing our Christian faith, teacheth vs, that Christ was included for a long time in the wombe of a woman; that he was swadled, and lapped in Cloaths; that then he might fall vpon the earth; and might also haue beene eaten with beasts, or burnt (if so by miracle, he were not preserued from such mischances) if then he was truly, and in his owne person subiect to all these difficulties without any dishonor; what dishonour is it to him, if he did vndergoe (in another forme) the former supposed indecencyes vrged by our Aduersaries?

Thirdly, The former Indignities do no more truly, and properly touch the Body of Christ, then the Diuinity (because it is present in all places) can be said to be burnt, it being in the fire, or to be rotten, it being in bodyes that are rotten &c.

Lastly, this kind of our Aduersaries arguing is borrowed from the old Hereticks, denying other poynts of Christian Religion. Thus we find, that the *Arians* impugned the Diuinity of Christ (as appeareth from *Hilarius l. 12. de Trinitate*) from reasons drawne concerning the honour, and dignity of the Father. In like sort, the *Marcionistes*, deny ing the *Incarnation* did obiect (as we read in *Tertullian lib. de carne Christi*) that it was an Indignity to God, to be inclosed in the wombe of a woman, to lye in a Manger &c. Finally, the *Iewes* chiefely rest in obiecting against vs *Christians*, that we belieue in a Man (*as Iustinus witnesseth in Dialogo cum Tryphone*) *which was crucified among theeues*. By all which examples we are instructed, how litle auayleable those Arguments are, which our Aduersaries doe draw from the Indignities (supposing that they were true) which seeme to proceed from our Catholike doctrine of the Eucharist.

Now touching the vnprofitableness of the Catholike doctrine in this point, our Aduersaries do obiect, that the reall being of Christs Body in the Eucharist is needlesse, in that seeing the end, and fruite of the Eucharist is to nourish the Soule, and this nourishment consisting in Faith, and Charity, may as auaileably be performed by apprehending Christ by faith, as he is only in Heauen; it followeth, that no profit ariseth from the Catholike doctrine herein, which is not by other meanes aswell effected.

To this I answere: First, that it is false to affirme, that the same fruite is reaped by apprehending Christ in heauen, as by receauing him really into our Bodyes: Since experience doth witnesse, that by this receauing him in the Eucharist, our Faith, Charity, Deuotion, and Reuerence are more increased: Besides our Reall Coniunction with Christ affoardeth many benefits to the Soule, which Christ giueth not without this Coniunction; no otherwise then he cured all such,

as touched the hemme of his garment, whom he would not (notwithstanding that he could) if they had not touched it.

Secondly, it is a false Illation, to conclude, It was not conuenient, that Christ should be really in the Eucharist, because the fruite reaped therby, may be obtayned by other meanes; for that is profitable, which doth conferre any good, though the same good may be obtayned by other wayes, for no man will deny, but that Christ could haue cured the sicke, and infirme, if they believed in him, though they had not touched his garments, or his hands, yet it followeth not that the touch therof was vnprofitable to them. In like sort, one drop of Christs Bloud, or any laborious worke vndertaken by him for our good, had bene sufficient for our Redemption; yet it followeth not, that all his paines, wounds, effusion of his Bloud, and death it selfe were vnprofitably, and bootlessely performed; yea God could haue redeemed the world without the Incarnation of Christ, shall we therfore say, that the Incarnation of Christ was needlesse, inconuenient, and vnprofitable?

Finally, our Aduersaries obiect, that the doctrine of the Reall Presence is hurtfull, in that it followeth, that the Body of Christ is giuen to the wicked with prophaning therof. To which may be answered (besides that, which is aboue said, touching the Indignity offered to Christ by this Doctrine) that no inconuenience, or domage aryseth to Christs body, being distributed to the wicked, but the great Charity of God is shewed therein; for we see that the Sunne-beames do light vpon most foule places, and putrifyed bodyes, they being in no sort corrupted, or defiled therby; why should then the Body of our Sauiour being after a spirituall, and supernaturall manner in the Eucharist, receaue any detryment, hurt, or losse, by it entring into the bodyes of the wicked?

(o) *From reasons drawne.*] Seeing that the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, doth euer presuppose the Reall Presence, therfore the Reasons heere alledged are preuayling chiefly against the Lutherans, and all such Protestants, as do acknowledge a true and reall being of Christs Body in the Eucharist. Therfore supposing that Christ would truly exhibite his body to vs, these Congruentiall Motyues following may perswade vs that he would not there haue it ioyned with bread, but to be absolutely alone by it selfe.

First, in that if the substance of bread should remaine with the body of Christ in the Eucharist. Then two different Substances should haue one and the same respect and relation to the same Accidences, and should be demonstreted by the same Accidences, as by certaine externall signes: And which is more, the first and principall relation

of

of the Accidences should be to the Bread, and only a secondary relation to the Body of Christ; the reason heerof being, in that the substãce of the bread (and not the Body of Christ) is informed with those Accidences. But this would be most inconuenient, since from hence it would follow, that the Actions performed by the Priest, or the Cõmunicant should first agree to the bread, & secondarily only to the Body of Christ; And thus if one do aske, what is eleuated, what is eaten, or what the Accidences do there signify, or one should then answere, a peece of Wheaten Bread, and the Body of Christ: which poynt could not stand with the dignity and reuerence of Christs Body.

Secondly, it would appeare much opposite to the dignity of Christs Body, that one and the same meate should be nourishment both to our Soules and Bodyes, and it consequently would breed in vs a lesse reuerence to the Body of Christ there present.

Thirdly, supposing the Bread to be in the Eucharist, then could not the Eucharist be taken fasting: and hence it followeth, that none could seuerall tymes communicate the same day: And yet according to *S. Augustine epist.* 118. *c.* 6. euen by the Decree of the Apostles, the Body of Christ ought to be taken only of such as are fasting: As also it appeareth from *S. Gregory homil.* 8. *in Euang.* that vpon Christmas day the Priest did celebrate three tymes, during the tyme of the Primitiue Church.

Fourthly (and perhaps principally) it is fitting, that the bread should not be in the Eucharist with the Body of Christ, in regard of the danger growing therby, to wit, for feare that the more ignotant & simple should adore the bread, since such do not distinguish, but absolutely adore that which lyeth vnder the Accidences. Now that it was conuenient, that the Accidences of bread and wine should remayne, and not be changed, appeareth by other like Reasons of Cõgruency. First, because if they were absent, then there would be no sensible signe in the Eucharist, and consequently it would cease to be a Sacrament. Secondly, by reason, that in regard of the presence of the Accidences, the worth and merit of our faith is increased. Thirdly, they being absent, it would be a horrour to Mans nature to eate Mans flesh. Fourthly, if they were absent, then this Proposition (*Hoc est Corpus meum*) could not be true, since then the whole should be so changed into the whole, as that nothing should remayne common to both the *Termini* of this Conuersion.

(p) *The pillar and foundation.*] According to that, *Columna, & Firmamentum Veritatis*. Tim. c. 3.

THE

THE CONCLVSION.

HEERE now, *Good Reader* (for to thee only I will turne my pen, since my humble thoughts daie not presume to direct any further speeches vnto his *Maiesty*) thou hast this meane, and impolished discourse, in regard of the Subiect whereof all Pens (yea the tongues of Angells) are to be reputed most vnworthy: from hence thou mayst (according to my Method) be instructed of two things. First of the Possibility of this great Mystery: Secondly of the Authorities (both humane, and diuine) prouing, that what herein by Gods Power may be performed, the same was through his Diuine Godnesse, and pleasure in the Institution of the Eucharist, actually effected.

And concerning the first Point, we are to conceaue, that as in the firster part hereof, it is demonstrated, that God is *Omnipotent*; so doth our Christian Faith teach vs, that he is (a) *iust*. Through his *Omnipotency* he is able to per-

performe what he promiseth; Through his *Iustice* he promiseth nothing, but what he will performe. Both these drawing equally togeather in him (for he hath (b) promised by the infallible Oracle of his written word, that he would giue his sacred Body, and Bloud to eate, and drinke) may warrant vs of the Truth of this high Mysterie.

In the second Part (to conuince, that Christ at his last Supper performed, what afore was prooued, that he was able to accomplish) thou hast set downe all the chiefest Authorities drawne from Gods sacred word; the answerable Prophesies of the Ancient Iewes herein; the beginning, and progression of the Sacramentarian Heresy particulerly displaied; the wrested testimonies of Scriptures alledged to the contrary, fully and satisfyingly answered; the stupendious Miracles wrought in proofe hereof recorded; and lastly (to omit other short insertions) the Fathers Iudgments in the same, as also in the particuler manner of *Transubstantiation*, most aboundantly manifested both by their owne expresse sayings, and by the plaine acknowledgement of our Sacramentaries.

It now remaineth, that vpon the mature deliberation of the former Premisses, thou consider (seeing with the (c) Psalmist, *Thou hast not receaued thy soule in vayne*) to which side thou intendest to subiect thy iudgement herein. That is, whether thou wilt imbrace the Sacramentaries opinion (notwithstanding it is impugned by all forcible Proofes whatsoeuer) or that thou wilt be content (with all humble resignation of thy owne spirit to impath thy selfe in the way of reuerend Antiquity, and to follow their iudgements, who in Faith, and doctrine

followed the Apostles, I meane, the Iudgments of those Primitiue Fathers, Men remarkeable for Learning, since their owne Labours (left as Monumẽts to Posterity) are sufficient witnesses therof; Men of most eminent vertue, since God hath vouchsafed to seale their sanctity of life with the irrefragable testimonies of diuers (d) great Miracles. Finally men of a pure and vncorrupted Faith, since they then liued, when the Church of Christ was for her time, but in her Infancy, but for her perfection, in her youth and full growth, and therfore euen by the confession of our Sectaries, could not with a doynt consent teach any thing contrary to the doctrine of Christ, and his Apostles.

And thus the maine drift of these precedent Passages (for this is the Issue of the matter chiefly intended by me, and heere it resteth) resolues to this one poynt, to wit whether a Man desirous of his owne saluatiõ, should in this high, and most reuerend Mysterie (vpon the true or false beliefe wherof depends his soules interminable weale, or woe) run one, and the same lyne of faith with *Augustine*, *Hierome*, *Chrysostome*, *Epiphanius*, the *Gregories*, the *Cyrills*, *Basil*, *Ambrose*, *Hilary*, *Athanasius*, *Cyprian*, *Irenæus*, *Ignatius*, and the like; or with *Zuinglius*, *Caluin*, and *Beza*.

But now since we are Christians, and are to beleeue in Christ, not in outward sense; Let vs turne our pen from all disputable Points of the matter, and acknowledging the certainty, admire Gods incõprehensible Goodnes therin; for as the Heauens spend their Motions by distributing their Heat, Light, & other vertues to the earth; so the Creatour of the Heauens hath vouchsafed the Influence of his Grace by bestowing himselfe (in this most

dread-

dreadfull Mysterie) vpon Man, the Earths chiefest creature. Thus by receauing his sacred Body, and Bloud, we containe him within our selues, whom the Heauens cannot containe, and inclose him in our breasts, who in himselfe incloseth all this ALL.

In like sort at this celestiall Table we feed on him, who giues himselfe aswell to thousands, as to one, and yet euery one receaues as much therof, as those thousads: who equally imparteth himself to good, & bad, and yet they both partake therof with most vnequall Effect. To be short, who (e) cõmaunding euery one to eate of his flesh, and drinke of his bloud, is much offended with diuers men communicating therof, and yet commaundeth nothing wherwith he is offended; for it is the Vnpreparation, not the Participation, which displeaseth him: which Point cannot seeme strange to vs Christians, for we read, that the (f) Vncircumcised could not eate the *Phase*: Which *Phase*, or *Paschall Lambe* (since (g) typically it represented the Eucharist) could not be eaten but with gyrded loynes, and shooes on their feet, which figure out in our Lords Supper our holy desires; with vnleauened bread, wherby is shaddowed our azimous, and pure intentions; finally with the mixture of certaine bitter hearbes, signifying sharp compunction for our former Impieties; so necessary it is for our soule to be cloathed with her wedding garment, when she presumeth to come to so great a banquet.

And now to draw to an end of that, which in it selfe is endlesse; since Gods *Power* and *Goodnesse* are in the Institution of this Sacrament, paralell one to the other, & that Mans vnderstanding cãnot penetrate into the depth of eyther of them (for betweene things finite, and infi-

nite, there is proportion only in disproportion) let vs admire his *Power*, as being able to effect so great a worke. Let vs admire his *Goodnes*; as being willing to worke it far Mans benefit; and in a deep, and silent Cõtemplation of both (for words are defectiue herein) let vs conclude with that Graue, and Reuerend (h) Father: *Ignis immortalis sunt Mysteria Christi; noli temerè ea perscrutari, ne in ipsorum perscrutatione comburaris.*

(a) *He is iust.*] Psalm. 11.

(b) *For he hath promised.*] *Answerably to that of S. Iohn 6. Panis, quem ego dabo, caro mea est pro mundi vita.*

(c) *With the Psalmist.*] Psalm. 24.

(d) *Great Miracles.*] Examples hereof see recorded in diuers Authors, and Historiographers.

(e) *Commanding euery one.*] According to those words *Iohn 6. Nisi manducaueritis carnem filij Hominis, & biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis.*

(f) *The Incircumcised.*] *Exod. c. 12.*

(g) *Typically it represented.*] Hereof *S. Augustine l. 2. contra literas Petiliani c. 37. Aliud est Pascha, quod Iudæi de aue celebrant, aliud quod nos in corpore, & sanguine Domini accipimus.*

(h) *Reuerend Father.*] *Ephrem lib. de Natura Dei minime scrutanda c. 3.*

BRITISH 8 JUS6 MUSEUM

FINIS.